

THE STANDARD

NO. 77-VOL. III, N

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 23, 1888.

PRICE FIVE CENTS

THE STANDARD FOR THE CAMPAIGN.
Subscriptions to THE STANDARD from now to the close of the campaign will be received at the following rates:
Single subscription 80c
Ten or more, each 70c
One hundred or more, each 65c

"The Standard" is sent this week to a number of persons whose friends have paid to have the paper forwarded to them for four weeks in the hope that they may be induced to read it, examine the principles it advances and become regular subscribers. Those who receive the paper without having ordered it will understand that it has been sent in this manner and will be sent for four successive weeks without charge to them.

Terms of subscription will be found on the fourth page.

CONTENTS.

The Chicago Conference.
Governor Hill's Veto of the Electoral Reform Bill.
Property is Literary Productions.
Single Tax in Chicago.
Charity Organization.
Outspoken Against Indirect Taxation.
The Chicago Conference.
Pen, Pencil and Scissors.
Where Are These Acres?
The "Magic City."
The First Essential Reform.
It is a Free Trade Fight.
The Tariff Reduction Bill.
Colorado "Overcrowded."
Nothing to Be.
The Beating of the Drums.
Men and Things.
Mr. Carnegie's Holiday.
Society Notes.
Louis Prang.
Free Trade the American Idea.
New Ideas, Methods and Inventions.
England and America.
Overlooked Reciprocity.
A Song of Protection.
Straws Which Show the Wind.
Christianity—Spirit and Practice.
Current Thought.

Warren Worth Bailey, who by authority of a large number of individual requests called the conference of single tax men to meet in Chicago on July 4, authorizes THE STANDARD to announce the withdrawal of the call. In this Mr. Bailey has acted with good judgment and in consonance with the changed opinion of those who at first were most desirous of the conference. And for the trouble he has taken for the making of arrangements and the correspondence that has been necessary has entailed much work—he deserves our thanks as much, and even more, than if the conference had taken place. After the presidential election is over we shall be able to come together under much more favorable circumstances.

The Central labor union of New York city passed the following resolutions at its meeting last Sunday without a dissenting voice:

Whereas, A bill securing to the voters of the state of New York electoral reform recently passed the legislature and was placed in the hands of Governor Hill for his signature; and

Whereas, The workings of this state have been emphatically signified their approval of such a bill, believing that it would have secured them the sanctity of the ballot; and

Whereas, When the said bill came before Governor Hill, he vetoed it in compliance, as we believe, with the dictation of a corrupt political machine, which foresaw, in electoral reform, the death of their political power.

Resolved, That we, the Central labor union in session assembled, do hereby condemn the action of Governor Hill in ignoring the expressed will of the people by refusing to sign the electoral reform bill.

These resolutions undoubtedly express the opinion of the great majority of the workingmen of this state, and not of workingmen alone, but of all citizens who realize the corrupt condition of our politics.

There is but one way to give this opinion any effect that politicians will respect, and that is to back it by votes. And the democratic managers ought to be admonished in advance that if Governor Hill is nominated again this year he will lose the vote of every man otherwise inclined to vote the democratic ticket who has this greatest of all political reforms at heart.

The reasons, or to speak more properly, the excuses, which Governor Hill, in the memorandum filed with the bill, gives for his veto, only add certainty to the declaration made by the Central labor union that his real motive was the preservation of the power of the corrupt political machines, which the changes proposed in the bill would have destroyed. Read in the light of the facts—known to no one more certainly than to Governor Hill—that the electors of the state of New York to-day have practically no choice but between the nominees of one or the other of the political machines, and that great numbers of voters are at every election corrupted or intimidated, these excuses only add insult to injury.

The bill popularly known as the Australian or electoral reform bill is officially entitled "An act to secure more fully the independence of electors and the secrecy of the ballot." Its provisions are such as experience has shown to be necessary to this end. With a view of doing away with the necessity which political parties are now under of printing and distributing tickets and employing workers at the polls—things which by the great expense they impose and the organization they require, compel the formation of political machines, and give their bosses power to

canvass or election—the bill proposes the printing of official ballots and the presentation to every voter of every candidate. It provides that the names of candidates nominated by conventions representing three per cent of the vote cast, or nominated directly by voters amounting to one per cent of the vote cast, at the previous election—or to 1,000 in the state or 100 in a political subdivision—shall be printed at public expense upon ballots which the voter is to receive at the polls. For the purpose of preventing any stuffing of the ballot boxes, the ballot clerks are to write their initials upon the back of the ballot before handing it to the voter. He is then to retire into a private apartment, make a mark against the names of those he desires to vote for, or write in any names he pleases, and then vote the ballot so folded as to conceal whom he votes for. In order to acquaint the voter with the names of candidates that he will find upon the ballot, the bill provides for the publication of a list of candidates in two papers in each county, and for the hanging up about the polls of cards containing their names. To prevent wanton obstruction of the voting, it limits the time during which the voter may remain in the private apartment to five minutes. To prevent wanton delay and wanton destruction of ballots, it provides that the voter who spoils his ballot, before receiving another in its place and being entitled to occupy the apartment for another five minutes, shall satisfy the ballot clerks that his spoiling of the ballot was not intentional. To meet the case of those who cannot read, it not only provides for the advertisement of candidates in newspapers and by cards, but the illiterate may require one of the ballot clerks to read him the contents of the ballot, so that he may know the relative positions of the names. Or one of the ballot clerks, sworn to secrecy, and acting under penal provisions, may, at his request, make the marks or do the writing for him.

How these provisions would cure the evils which in this state have made our elections little better than the ratification of the edicts of one set or another of political bosses, is obvious to any one who knows anything of elections in New York. Yet Governor Hill actually assumes to find in them restrictions which would impair the constitutional right of the voter to vote for whom he pleases.

The reasons he gives for this assumption are: That the candidates whose names were thus printed on the ballots and advertised would have an advantage over the others! That the advertising of names is to be only in two papers in each county, representing political parties that in the last election cast the largest and next largest number of votes! That the ballot clerks are "not selected for their character or their political impartiality" but from the same two parties! That the ballot clerks may deny another ballot to the voter who has spoiled a ballot, if they are not satisfied that the spoiling was unintentional! And that votes will be lost if the ballot clerks fail to put their initials upon the ballot—notwithstanding the fact that it is the business of the voter, the inspectors and the watchers to see that they do. The mere statement of these "reasons" is a sufficient answer.

To these remarkable reasons why he considers the electoral reform bill repugnant to the spirit, if not to the letter, of the constitution, Governor Hill adds two others fully as remarkable. The first is that the five minutes which the voter is allowed to spend in the apartment is not enough. "The anxiety, the deliberation, the care, the caution, with which electors at present prepare their ballots, meditating them for days, reconsidering and changing them down to the last moment, exhibit by experience that the hurry, confusion and precipitancy to which this bill compels the voter, is fatal to the free and full operation of his own intelligent volition in the direction of his vote."

Governor Hill is evidently thinking of the voters he has been standing round the polls in Elmira, cautiously meditating as to who will give them the largest price. This is the only class of voters whose meditations would be hurried or disturbed. All others would have ample opportunity to decide whom they would vote for. Official and non-official publicity would be given to the names of candidates for days before the election. And the voter's business in the compartment would simply consist in making marks (probably from an already marked advertisement or card which he would carry with him) against names previously decided on.

The other objection is that, "under the present law, the illiterate or infirm elector reposes his trust in some confidential friend for the preparation of his ballots,

but by this bill he must either lose his vote or avow it to a stranger."

How very careful of infirm and illiterate voters is Governor Hill that he thinks it unconstitutional to provide that one of two sworn public officers, as they may select, shall be permitted to do for them what they cannot do for themselves, to the exclusion of confidential friends! Here is an illustration of the sort of confidential friends that the Central labor union, not without reason, think the governor is really solicitous for. It is from an article in last Sunday's Sun, in which that journalistic supporter of Governor Hill and enemy of electoral reform, admiringly describes Mr. Simon Kelley, "king of Weehawken," who regularly carries that place for the straight democratic ticket:

Election day Simon will always be found at the polls in Weehawken, with a poll list in one hand and democratic ballots in the other. Sometimes a democratic voter will step up, watch his chance, and try to slip in a ballot without being seen by the king. He always misses it, and this is the conversation that generally follows:

"Got your ticket, Joe?"
"Yes, sir."
"Is it the right one?"
"Ye-yes, sir."
"Sure?"
"Ye-ye-yes, sir."
"Let's see it?"
The ballot is produced. It isn't the right one, and Simon looks reproachfully at his disobedient subject, calmly tears the ballot up, hands him a straight democratic ticket, and watches it deposited.

After giving his "reasons" for deeming the bill unconstitutional, Governor Hill adds, that it "contains many serious, important and substantial defects." These he states as follows:

1.—It omits, through inadvertence or otherwise, to provide any method or means of filling any vacancy which may occur upon any ticket, by reason of the death, resignation or inability of any candidate, happening within fifteen days of an election. In other words, a mere accident is permitted virtually to disfranchise a whole party, and no remedy is provided for it.

The answer is, that it is impossible to guard against such accidents, which, even if nominations were delayed until the eve of election, might happen on the day of election; that some time must be fixed for the closing of nominations, and that the time of fifteen days before election is a reasonable one, preventing, as ought to be prevented, the holding back of nominations in order to avoid scrutiny, and securing to voters opportunity to examine into the character of the candidates.

2.—It omits to provide how the ballot clerks who are to serve at the first election held under the act are to be elected or appointed.

This is not true. Section 19 of the act provides that they shall be elected or appointed at the same time and in the same manner as inspectors of election.

3.—It provides that the county clerk shall deliver the legal ballots to the inspectors of election of each election district before the opening of the polls. How long prior to such opening this delivery is to be made is not provided. Nor is it prescribed how, when, or in what manner, the ballot clerks are to receive the ballots from the inspectors.

This is trivial. The bill provides for the printing of the ballots, for their delivery to the inspectors before the opening of the polls, and for the ballot clerks then having charge of them, which is all that is necessary. It is to be remembered that they do not become legal ballots until initiated by the ballot clerks when handed to the voters:

4.—It provides that the expense of the printing and the distribution of the ballots shall in all cases be a county charge. There is no good reason why counties should assume any part of the expenses of municipal elections, and this provision is unjust and was clearly not intended.

This objection so far as it goes is valid. But it not only does not furnish any sufficient reason for rejecting the bill, but is of very little weight. Not only are the larger political divisions now in many cases put to expenses which might be more properly devolved on the smaller, but the economy in election expenses secured by the bill would much more than make up for any disproportionate expense to which some of the counties might thus be subjected.

5. It requires that the selection of ballot clerks shall be made from the two principal political parties, refusing any representation whatever to the prohibition party, the labor people, or any other third party organization.

The smaller parties have no representation now. The law which gave the united labor party in New York city representation at the last election required the casting of 50,000 votes.

6.—It assumes to provide that no person shall be permitted to be near the elector when he is "within the rail," and yet by the words which follow that clause it permits such contact when allowed "by authority of the inspectors of election," thus destroying the value of the other preceding provision.

The words of the bill are:

No person other than the elector engaged in receiving, preparing or depositing their ballots shall be permitted to be within said rail, except by authority of the inspectors of elections.

The exception is obviously necessary to provide for the removal of an elector who refuses to leave after the expiration of his

time, or for other such cases. Governor Hill is much troubled about the possibility of candidates dying after they are nominated, but has neglected to think of the possibility of an elector dying or falling in a fit when within the rail.

8.—The provision in section 27 requiring the county clerk of each county to cause the name of the candidate to be printed "in large type" is altogether too vague and indefinite. No statute so important as this should be so loosely constructed, but all its terms should be couched in clear and explicit language.

This terrible indefiniteness relates merely to the cards giving instructions to the voter, which by section 27 the county clerks are required to have printed in English and such other languages as they deem necessary, and the inspectors are required to post. The words of the section are: "Said cards shall be printed in large, clear type."

9.—So hastily or imperfectly was the measure prepared that it omits to provide what compensation, if any, the officials known as "ballot clerks" are to receive for their services.

It is frequently the case that legislative acts create an office, and provide for filling it, without making any provision for compensation. In this case there was ample time to provide for compensation, as the bill would not have gone into effect until the election of 1889.

Governor Hill's final objection to the bill is as follows:

Under this bill any person who can procure a thousand names to his petition can become a candidate for a state office and compel all his tickets to be printed in every county in the state at public expense; and any adventurer, no matter how obscure or unworthy, who can manage to obtain one hundred names to his petition, can become a candidate for an office in a senatorial or congressional district, or in a county or municipality, and likewise compel all his tickets to be printed at public expense. With such inducements held out, the state, district, county and municipality would be likely to be flooded with candidates possessing little share of public confidence or favor, to the annoyance and distrust, as well as at the expense of the people.

Governor Hill began by objecting that the bill would give some candidates the advantage of getting their tickets printed at public expense, and that this would be to "restrict the elector in the methods by which he may choose to present a candidate for the popular suffrage, and to discriminate between candidates because of the manner in which they are presented to the people." He ends by objecting that the bill makes it too easy for candidates to get their tickets printed!

That the governor's last objection is better than his first, and that the bill, in endeavoring to make it easy for the citizen to run for office, has perhaps made it too easy, may readily be conceded. But it is certainly best in beginning the new system that any error should be on this side. As for the additional expense that an extra candidate would entail, it must be remembered that it amounts to but the setting of a single line of type, and perhaps an inch of paper.

The ballot might be as big as an eight page tract, without any practical disadvantage to the voter, for the bill requires that the names of the candidates of each party shall be grouped together on their proper ballots under their party designations. And the printing of two ballots for each voter, as the bill provides, and the cost of advertisement, would be as nothing to the printing of hundreds and thousands for each voter, the payment of advertising and mailing expenses, and the hiring of workers to stand at the polls, under the present system. It is true that under the present system these expenses are paid directly by the parties or candidates, while under the reform bill they would be a public charge. But is there any doubt that under the present system, tax payers must ultimately pay election expenses, and pay them with good interest besides?

Governor Hill pays to the public opinion that supports the bill he has vetoed the tribute of saying that he would "cheerfully approve a well considered measure which should provide substantially that each elector, just before depositing his ballot, should enter a separate compartment or booth provided for that purpose, where he can alone assort and arrange his tickets to suit himself, and from this compartment proceed directly to the inspectors, unattended by any one, and deposit his ballots.

Yet not only would such a measure fail to effect that breaking up of the power of machines and bosses which would be secured by the official printing of ballots, but the excuses which the governor has given for his veto of the bill presented to him are convincing proof that he would find excuses enough for withholding his signature from any bill, of even the kind he proposes, that might be worth the paper it was engrossed upon. Indeed, Governor Hill, in this very memorandum, declares in true

demagogic style that any provision that would prevent heeled from assembling round the voter, and bribers and intimidators from tempting or coercing him up to the very polls, would be an infringement of the constitution. What else does this mean?

Here the people are upon an equality, and at the ballot box all are freemen and equals. It has never heretofore been regarded as a crime for one citizen peaceably to discuss with his neighbor at the polls the merits of the various parties and candidates, and to compare views and to inform each other, if they desired, how they intended to vote. The right of the people "peaceably to assemble" is guaranteed by the constitution, which also forbids the passage of any law which shall "abridge the liberty of speech," and the old fashioned New England town meeting, which is the foundation of all our election laws, recognizes the right of the people to converse with and "electioneer" one another at the polls.

Governor Hill's attempt to pick flaws in the ballot bill has in short only proved the strength of the bill and the care with which it was drawn to fit into our existing election system. And it has also proved what his reputation, affiliations, and previous course in exerting his influence to beat the bill in its passage through the legislature, gave good reason to expect—that he can be counted on to use any power intrusted to him to maintain the present corrupt system of elections and thus preserve the machines. His re-election would end any hope of obtaining electoral reform for another term. It would not only continue an enemy of that reform in the governor's chair, it would be notice to all concerned that in this matter it is more profitable to please the machines than the people.

If Governor Hill is renominated by the democratic machines out of gratitude for the additional lease of power he has given them, every democrat in the true and original sense of the term—every citizen who really desires to make this a government of the people and not of bosses, should spare no efforts to defeat him.

Perhaps for the sake of electoral reform itself, Governor Hill's nomination is really to be desired. For in that case the republicans will make electoral reform an important part of their campaign in New York, and the defeat of Governor Hill, especially if the state goes for Mr. Cleveland, will be such an evidence of the determination of the people that we shall have the ballot bill in operation as quickly as if Governor Hill had signed it.

NORWICH, N. Y.—It is almost a relief to find even a trivial and passing remark of THE STANDARD to differ with. At the most only three such have refreshed me with a sense of my own superiority of judgment. Postal savings banks (interest paying), and woman suffrage are two of these; but it is to the third that I propose a protest. I do not believe that there is any natural property in the creations of one's brains, or that a government countenances robbery that fails to enact a copyright law for the protection of foreign authors. If I publish my thought or my knowledge by shouting it on the streets or by printing and hawking it, it is no longer mine, except for the credit of it. If a government conceives it politic to encourage its wise men by granting them statutory monopolies in their writings and inventions, it is well; but justice makes no such demand; and it is difficult to see the policy of protecting the production of that which has its own sufficient incentive in the laws of other countries. The author's cry of "robber" seems to me as impertinent as the manufacturer's demand for protection.

The difficulty of my correspondent arises from confusions of thought, which are so common that it is worth while endeavoring to clear them up. Even the advocates of international copyright seldom put their claims upon the true ground, and, with the exception—to her honor!—of the republic of Mexico, which gives perpetual copyright, the copyright laws of all civilized countries, like our own domestic copyright law, seem to treat the right of the author to control the publication of his book as though it rested upon the same ground and was of the same nature as the patents granted for invention. The constitution of the United States itself does this in declaring that "the congress shall have power to promote the progress of science and the useful arts by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries."

Nevertheless, though superficially alike, there is an essential difference between the patent for an invention and the copyright for a book. The one, which gives a right of property in the use of a device or process—that is to say, in an idea—rests on no natural right, but can only be upheld as a matter of policy. The other gives no property in ideas. It merely recognizes the right of property in a particular form, itself a product of labor, in which ideas are made tangible; a right which, irrespective of questions of policy, is a natural right—resting on the same ground as the right of the fisherman to the fish he catches, of the farmer to the crop he raises, of the builder to the house he constructs.

There has reached me by the last English mail a little book which I am glad to see. It is a text book on Political Economy by Professor J. E. Symes of University college, Nottingham, published by Rivingtons of London. I am exceedingly glad to see it, for it is to me one of the indications that certain great truths which I have striven to popularize are nearing the last of the three stages into which some one, whose name I now forget, divided the progress of a great truth:

1.—It is ridiculous and not to be considered.

2.—It is against religion and destructive of the rights of property and society.

3.—We always knew it.

In this book Professor Symes never once mentions my name nor so much as alludes to me or to any of my writings, for he judges rightly. I think that it will be read and accepted by many who would be repelled by prejudice from anything bearing my name. Yet the essential doctrines of this book, which are put so quietly and unaggressively that squire and parson and newspaper writer, to whom Henry George is a dangerous communist, are not likely to notice them, or understand what revolution they mean, are the economic doctrines of "Progress and Poverty," stated as if "we always knew it."

As a matter of fact, Professor Symes got these ideas from my writings—a matter he would be free enough to acknowledge were there no reason why it would be impolitic. But my American copyright gives me no power to prevent the circulation of Professor Symes's book, as a patent in an analogous case would give power to prohibit the use of an invention. Nor have I any moral right to ask it. When another sees these truths they are as much as they are mine. If I discovered them it was only in the sense that one may discover the belt of Orion. They are there to be seen, and have been seen, and will be seen by many before and independently of me. All I, or any one else, can do is to point another in their direction. To really see them, he must see them for himself, with his own powers of perception.

Here is the general principle on which all just rights of property must rest and to which they must conform.

Man finds himself in a world which he did not make; but having in himself certain original and personal powers which enable him, not exactly to make things, for man cannot create, but, within limits that are perhaps undefinable, to make things conform to his needs and desires by bringing what he finds here into form and relation. As a matter of abstract justice it is evident that the right of individual ownership cannot attach to what was here before man and independent of man, to what individuals did not make and cannot make; but that it does attach to things produced—i. e. brought forth—by human exertion. This is the true basis of the right of property. It rests in the last analysis upon the right of the human being to himself, to the use of his own powers and to the benefit of his own exertions. What a man makes, as we say—what, to speak more properly, he produces or brings forth—we all naturally recognize as his. He may pass this right by gift or sale so that it will in full force rest in another. But he cannot justly be deprived of it, save under those conditions in which all individual rights may disappear under pressure of general exigency. In other words, the moral and natural right of property is derived from labor. So clear is this that when we find men attempting to defend conventional rights of property in things not produced by labor we invariably find them confusing the species of things and adducing arguments which are in reality based on that right of property which springs from labor.

Thus while there does exist to things produced by human labor a clear and exclusive right of individual ownership—a right antecedent to and independent of human law, it is evident that no one can claim as his own what no man produced. Natural laws indeed require that we should recognize a right of individual possession or occupancy of portions of the earth's surface, for this is necessary to the security of the right of property in the proceeds of labor, and can be recognized without injury to common rights. But no man can justly claim ownership of the earth itself, or of the elements about the earth and beyond the earth. Nor can any man justly claim ownership in natural laws; nor in any of the relations which may be perceived by the human mind; nor in any of the potentialities which nature holds for it. These are of the heritage with which all men are endowed by their Creator—or, if there are any who do not like that phrase, of that system of things which we call

nature, and in which we find ourselves. Ownership comes from production. It cannot come from discovery. Discovery can give no right of ownership. Islands, continents, stars, natural laws and relations, new ways of doing things, or the possibility of doing new things, may be discovered, and this discovery may be the result of labor. But no man can discover anything which, so to speak, was not put there to be discovered, and which some one else might not in time have discovered. If he finds it, it was not lost. It, or its potentiality, existed before he came. It was there to be found.

It is evidently the perception of this truth, that discovery can give no just claim to ownership, that leads my correspondent to think there can be no basis in justice for ownership in literary productions, and gives rise to the common assertion in this connection that there can be no property in productions of the brain. He is right enough as to the principle, but he is confused in its application. He confounds the copyright with the patent, just as the framers of our constitution seem to have confounded it, and as it is generally confounded, and proceeds on the supposition that it involves the right of property in ideas.

In this he is clearly mistaken. The exclusive privilege given by a patent—the exclusive privilege of making a certain kind of machine or using a certain device, or applying a certain combination for a certain purpose, does confer property in an idea, a perception, or the use of a natural law. It prevents all but the grantee from making that kind of a machine or using that kind of a device, or applying that kind of a combination. But the recognition of the exclusive right of the author to reprint his book gives no such exclusive privilege. It prevents no one from writing that kind of a book. It prevents no one from using either his own ideas or even the ideas he may find in the copyrighted book. It recognizes a right of property, not in any facts stated, not in any thoughts expressed, not in any discovery pointed out, not in any moral drawn; but merely in the book itself—in that particular arrangement of words which gives it identity as a particular piece of work clearly distinguishable from works by other authors, or even from another work on the same subject written by the same author—should he try to do the same thing twice.

"If I publish my thought or my knowledge by showing it on the streets or by printing or hawking it, it is no longer mine, except for the credit of it," says my correspondent. This is quite true in the sense that I am no longer the exclusive possessor of it—as I might possibly have imagined myself to be before. But in the sense that publication takes away any right of ownership, it is not the full truth. To a thought or perception there is no right of ownership either before or after publication. Every one has a moral right to think what I think or perceive what I perceive. He may do it independently of me or he may do it on the hint from me. But in neither case have I any moral right to forbid him. Nor does a copyright give me any power to forbid him.

No matter how hard may have been the mental process by which I arrive at certain conclusions, or how laboriously I may have discovered certain facts, as soon as I publish them—and it is only when I do publish them that the copyright laws apply—any one may appropriate them and use them as his own. All that the copyright law gives me is the right of property in the particular book—in the particular and identical form in which the ideas set forth in my book are expressed.

This form is the result of my labor in the same sense and to the same extent that a coat or a house is the result of labor. And for the same reason there attaches to it of natural right the same exclusive right of ownership. In the production of any material thing—a machine, for instance—there are two separable parts—the abstract idea or principle, which may be usually expressed by drawing, by writing or by word of mouth; and the concrete form of the particular machine itself, which is produced by bringing together in certain relations, certain quantities and qualities of matter, such as wood, steel, brass, brick, rubber, cloth, etc. There are two modes in which labor goes to the making of the machine—the one in ascertaining the principle on which such machines can be made to work; the other in obtaining from their natural reservoirs and bringing together and fashioning into shape the quantities and qualities of matter which in their combination constitute the concrete machine. In the first mode, labor is expended in discovery. In the second mode, it is expended in production. The work of discovery may be done once for all, as in the case of the discovery in prehistoric time of the principle or idea of the wheelbarrow. But the work of production is required afresh in the case of each particular thing. No matter how many thousand millions of wheelbarrows have been

produced, it requires fresh labor of production to make another one.

Now the expenditure of labor in the invention or discovery of the idea of a machine gives no natural right of ownership in the idea. Not only is the potentiality of such a machine a part of the common heritage to which there can be in justice no exclusive claim, but each invention or discovery is usually—perhaps, except in cases of sheer accident, it may be said invariably—only the last step in a series which began with the discovery of fire or the invention of the stone ax. And not only can we confidently say in the case of any device that supplies a need, and is therefore valuable, that if one person had not discovered it, others would have done so; but as a matter of fact it usually appears in such cases that a number of persons have been contemporaneously working toward the same end.

The natural reward of labor expended in discovery is in the use that can be made of the discovery without interference with the right of any one else to use it. But to this natural reward our patent laws endeavor to add an artificial reward. Although the effect of giving to the discoverers of useful devices or processes an absolute right to their exclusive use would be to burden all industry with most grievous monopolies, and to greatly retard, if not put a stop to, further inventions; yet the theory of our patent laws is that we can stimulate discoveries by giving a modified right of ownership in their use for a term of years. In this we seek by special laws to give a special reward to labor expended in discovery, which does not belong to it of natural right, and is of the nature of a bounty.

But as for labor expended in the second of these modes—in the production of the machine by the bringing together in certain relations of certain quantities and qualities of matter, we need no special laws to reward that. Absolute ownership attaches to the results of such labor, not by special law, but by common law. And if all human laws were abolished, men would still hold that whether it were a wheelbarrow or a phonograph, the concrete thing belonged to the man who produced it. And this, not for a term of years, but in perpetuity. It would pass at his death to his heirs or those to whom he devised it.

Now a book—I do not mean the printed and bound volume which is the result of the labor of printers, bookbinders, and subsidiary industries; but the succession of words which is the result of the labor of the author—if not a material thing, is quite as tangible a thing as a machine. And in the labor that goes to its production there are the same two separable parts. There is what I have called the "labor of discovery," which goes to the idea of the book, and as to which, as in the case of the inventor of the machine, the author must draw on those who have gone before, for a perfectly original literary man would have to begin by inventing letters. There is also the labor of production—labor of essentially the same kind, though it deals not with matter, but with immaterial things, as that which in the case of a machine is expended in bringing wood, steel, brass, etc., into certain proportions and relations. It is this labor of production, which results in a tangible identity, that gives ownership to the author as a matter of natural right. And it is this right of ownership, not in ideas, but in the tangible result of labor expended in production, that copyright secures.

I presume that one of the principal reasons why the real nature and grounds of property in literary productions is so little appreciated, is that what I have called the "labor of production" is little understood except by writers. The common idea is that the man who writes a book has only to decide as to what he wants to say and then sit down and write it out. Nothing could be more fallacious. Over and above any "labor of discovery" expended in thinking out what to say, is the "labor of production" expended on how to say it. Even the most carelessly written works require some of this. But carefully written works, and especially the works on thoughtful subjects that read as though they had flowed from the author's pen as easily and as naturally as water flows down hill, require in the mere labor of production, in the mere choice of words, arrangement of sentences and sequence of presentation, an amount and intensity of exertion that one who has not attempted it can hardly appreciate. If any one thinks that to write a book all that is necessary is to get the ideas and then write it out, let him sit down and try. If he has critical ability to judge of what he is doing, he will soon find himself involved in labor to which digging wells or breaking stones will seem easy; and will be long appreciate the good sense of the man who apologized for the length of a letter on the ground that he did not have time to write a short one. Now, this labor of literary production is essentially the same kind of labor as that

which produces houses, crops, clothing, ships, or any of the material things which man makes. It requires the exertion of the same will power; it involves the exhaustion of the same nervous energy. Mental work is no metaphorical phrase. Any one who has held himself to it knows that it is labor as truly as is physical work.

If my correspondent will think over the matter I am sure that he will see that it is on this firm basis that the right of property in literary productions rests, and that its recognition, instead of being like that system of spoliation called protection, an impairment and denial of natural right, is but the securing to the author of the natural reward of his labor. He will see that in permitting the works of foreign authors to be republished here without their permission we are really countenancing robbery, as truly as if we permitted our own people to despoil foreigners of their watches or their clothes. And if he has any doubt that in this, as in other things, "honesty is the best policy," he will see, if he chooses to trace it, the cramping and degrading effects of this legalization of robbery upon our national literature and national thought.

And this also is worth considering. The right to use an author's work without his consent, involves the right to use any part of it—to mutilate and garble. Many instances of this have occurred to foreign writers on this side of the water, and to American writers on that. Not long since a friend of mine, a newspaper man, met another newspaper man.

"What are you doing?" said my friend, "and why do you look so mournful?"

"I am editing Dickens, and I don't like the work."

"Editing Dickens! what do you mean?"

"I am editing Dickens for the library. It's my business to cut him down, so that every volume will come into 350 pages."

HENRY GEORGE.

THE SINGLE TAX IN CHICAGO.

A Concise Report of a Capable Speaker by J. Z. White.

An interesting discussion of the single tax doctrine took place at a meeting in Chicago on the 14th inst. The address of the evening was delivered by Mr. J. Z. White. He said:

Land is the basis of all wealth. Without land we could be no wealth. Land is useless without labor. Labor is helpless without access to land. There is nothing that we use but what is obtained from the earth, either directly or indirectly.

Capital is therefore the result of stored labor, and labor the utilization of land.

Access to land is the common right of all. The result of labor belongs to the laborer.

The common right of all cannot be exclusively an individual right; therefore the individual avails himself of a privilege in the exclusive occupancy of land, for which privilege he should pay in the form of a tax upon the land as the cause of the privilege.

Personal property (which includes buildings) being the result of labor, and labor being a natural right, it is wrong to tax it. To abolish that tax and to concentrate all taxes upon land is the object of the single tax movement.

Exchanges are more advantageously made in densely populated than in sparsely settled localities.

Equal justice to all would be established by free exchange, but, because of advantage of location, freedom of exchange is practically limited, inasmuch as exchange is often curtailed by location. For this advantage to some individuals the community receives an equivalent. We propose an equivalent in the form of a tax on the land at its true value.

It is a crude notion that when a man buys land he acquires the title to it.

No title can be better than that which precedes it.

That which a man makes belongs to him. The man who made the land has no more title to it than the man who made the house.

No man can convey a title to land because there is no title to convey.

The aristocracy of Europe originated in grants of land.

There is danger of a land aristocracy in this country.

Large tracts of land are obtained in a wild state, and so held; the influx of population places an increasing value upon it, and it is bequeathed as an inheritance for continual aggrandizement. Facts prove this. About one-half of Manhattan island is as wild today as it was a century ago! Within a few miles are the crowded tenement houses, where the piteously poor are suffocated every year for want of a little more room and a little more air!

The picture has its counterpart in Chicago. Three-fourths of the land in Chicago is vacant, held on speculation. It is as if so much of the city were cut off and that we were crowded on to a smaller earth.

Why is the waste land not utilized? At least it could produce something. Its owners would see that it did produce something if it were taxed at its true value.

We propose to tax land at its true value.

We propose to abolish taxes on personal property.

No man has the right to tax the product of his fellow laborer's toil.

No man can delegate to the government a right that he does not possess as an individual.

The tax that England attempted to impose on its subjects, which led to the American revolution, was an insignificant tax in comparison with that imposed on personal property to-day.

A liberal preacher recently deprecated these discussions on the ground that we were fanning the flame of discontent. He may rely upon us to fan that flame so long as discontent guards us from slavery.

Liberty is older than slavery.

The rights of man are founded upon eternal law.

It is in this spirit and for this purpose that we raise the cross of this new crusade.

Of Course.

St. Joseph, Mo.—The other day a friend was expatiating to me upon some patent French blacking he has got hold of. He told me that as a twenty-five cent bottle suffices for twenty applications, that is, a cost of one and a quarter cents per application, he now saves eight and three-quarter cents per day, as before it always cost him daily ten cents to have his shoes blacked. According to the protectionist idea is not this man an enemy of his country and ought not the bootblackening industry demand a protective duty?

A. K. MAYNARD.

CHARITY ORGANIZATION.

Josephine Shaw Lowell Defends Its Motives and Methods, and Rebukes Dr. De Costa.

To the Editor of the Standard—Sir: I was surprised to find in your column a letter and paper by the Rev. Dr. De Costa, condemning the principles and methods of the charity organization societies of New York and other cities, the statements of which, it is evident from your editorial comments, you have made no attempt to verify.

Dr. De Costa entirely misapprehends both the principles and methods of the various charity organization societies; and while I concede that the dangers and temptations of those societies lie in the direction he points out, I deny that what he says of their practice is true either in whole or in part.

I do not claim that the Charity organization society is the best way to deal with the poor, but I desire to say to your readers that that ideal is the lifting to an independent, self-respecting position of every individual who comes to it for help, and that it is at one with Dr. De Costa in his condemnation of "doles" as a means of helping any one permanently.

The main object of these societies, both here and in England, is to search out the causes of the poverty of individuals and to remove these, and thus to cure, instead of merely alleviating distress. I have found no better description of the ideal of the believer in the organization of charity, so far as regards the social masses, than the following, which was given by Dr. De Costa himself in a sermon preached last winter against the New York society, in which he thought he was describing the exact opposite of the course pursued by members of that society.

The particular part of the work of the society which is especially objected to by him, that is, its attempts to prevent dishonest persons from making a living by appeals to the sympathy of the benevolent, it undertakes mainly for the purpose of protecting others from the temptation to which the success of such methods on the part of their friends and neighbors exposes them; the protection of the pockets of those who give—except in so far as such protection makes the success of those who really need help more possible, is considered of far less importance. In other words, the discovery of impostors is a moral and not an economic work.

The charity organization societies agree with Dr. De Costa that pauperism mainly comes from "ignorance and the law of heredity," and therefore they seek to teach those in need and also to save their children from following in their footsteps. The societies differ from Dr. De Costa in believing that one of the potent causes of pauperism is "indiscriminate liberality," and for the sake of the paupers and of those who are tempted by indiscriminate liberality to become paupers, they seek to repress such liberality and to substitute for it intelligent liberality.

Your own evident ignorance of the aims of those who are trying to organize charity I regret very much. When you say that many of the charges made by Dr. De Costa are undoubtedly true, you show but little acquaintance with the work of the people you so hastily condemn, and when you give even an indirect and qualified sanction to his statement that "the managers regard the poor as a dangerous animal," you do a grievous injustice to the hundreds, nay thousands, of men and women who in this country and in England are spending their lives in trying to discover the best way not only to "comfort and help the weak hearted," but to radically improve the conditions under which the great mass of their fellow men live and work.

As I have said, the ostensible object of the charity organization societies is to seek out the causes of poverty in individuals, and to cure these; but this naturally leads to the study of the causes of poverty in general; and many of the members of those societies think earnestly and honestly upon social questions, and do and will help toward the solution of the social and moral problems which will still confront us for many years, even should the struggle for existence be rendered less bitter by the adoption of free trade and the single tax.

I consider myself entitled to speak with authority concerning the principles and methods of the New York charity organization society, at least, as I was one of its originators and am still a member of its central council.

JOSEPHINE SHAW LOWELL.
120 East 30th street, June 14, 1888.

OUTSPOKEN AGAINST INDIRECT TAXATION.

Philadelphia Workingmen Issue an Address and Some Tall Talking Against the Tariff.

By order of the Workingmen's tariff reform association No. 1 of Philadelphia, of which Thomas Grant is president, John Harle vice-president and F. A. Herwig secretary, an address has been issued to the workingmen of the United States, declaring for free trade, and calling upon their fellow toilers to vote with that party which advocates free raw materials and tariff reform.

The address asserts that toilers are no better off to-day than they were twenty years ago. All sorts of efforts, it says, have from time to time been made by workingmen to alleviate social ills, but their efforts have been directed against effects, not causes, and have resulted in destroying some wrongs only to make way for others. The root of the evil has not been attacked, and after another labor organization has succumbed without having accomplished a real and lasting remedy.

The first evil to be attacked, says the address, is the system of indirect taxation, which, under the specious plea of contributing to the support of government, taxes the masses for the benefit of a few individuals. And of this system the protective tariff is the chief feature. The danger in the very pretense of "protecting" labor is fully realized.

When monopoly professes anxiety for the protection of labor it is not applying the shares of the pickpocket, who claims your senses with flattering words while his nimble hands are deep in your pocket! It is not self-evident that if labor were the protection of labor is not applying the shares of the pickpocket, who claims your senses with flattering words while his nimble hands are deep in your pocket! It is not self-evident that if labor were

the protection of labor is not applying the shares of the pickpocket, who claims your senses with flattering words while his nimble hands are deep in your pocket! It is not self-evident that if labor were

the protection of labor is not applying the shares of the pickpocket, who claims your senses with flattering words while his nimble hands are deep in your pocket! It is not self-evident that if labor were

the protection of labor is not applying the shares of the pickpocket, who claims your senses with flattering words while his nimble hands are deep in your pocket! It is not self-evident that if labor were

the protection of labor is not applying the shares of the pickpocket, who claims your senses with flattering words while his nimble hands are deep in your pocket! It is not self-evident that if labor were

the protection of labor is not applying the shares of the pickpocket, who claims your senses with flattering words while his nimble hands are deep in your pocket! It is not self-evident that if labor were

the protection of labor is not applying the shares of the pickpocket, who claims your senses with flattering words while his nimble hands are deep in your pocket! It is not self-evident that if labor were

the protection of labor is not applying the shares of the pickpocket, who claims your senses with flattering words while his nimble hands are deep in your pocket! It is not self-evident that if labor were

the protection of labor is not applying the shares of the pickpocket, who claims your senses with flattering words while his nimble hands are deep in your pocket! It is not self-evident that if labor were

the protection of labor is not applying the shares of the pickpocket, who claims your senses with flattering words while his nimble hands are deep in your pocket! It is not self-evident that if labor were

the protection of labor is not applying the shares of the pickpocket, who claims your senses with flattering words while his nimble hands are deep in your pocket! It is not self-evident that if labor were

the protection of labor is not applying the shares of the pickpocket, who claims your senses with flattering words while his nimble hands are deep in your pocket! It is not self-evident that if labor were

the protection of labor is not applying the shares of the pickpocket, who claims your senses with flattering words while his nimble hands are deep in your pocket! It is not self-evident that if labor were

tariff duties now is forty-seven per cent, although the difference in the wages between this and other countries is not five per cent, calculated upon the relative productiveness of labor. Why, then, is this extra thirty per cent put on?

The answer given is that it frees big manufacturers from competition, while it does not interfere with their liberty to draw their labor from the markets of the world. The result is that labor is cheap and products are dear.

The methods which the Workingmen's tariff reform club means to pursue to attain its ends are thus described:

As workingmen we hold the interests of labor paramount to every other consideration, and hence we propose to push the battle for freedom from burdensome taxation—the key to labor question—to an early termination, in order to accomplish this most effectually we deem it our best policy, laying aside every bias and prejudice, to unite with any and all men who are fighting the same battle. It is in this way that we can make party serve us, and thus make the struggle for our rights a short and decisive one.

We care not by whatever other name you call it, we will support that party that is for free raw materials and tariff reform. If a good meal is set before us we will not stop to huddle over the question of who is the cook. We will no longer serve that party which will not serve us. We will cast our ballots, not for party, but for what we believe to be for the good of the toiling masses. We would not be honest—we would be neglectful of our interests—if we were to withhold our support from any party that stands before the country as the champion of free raw materials and tariff reform.

THE CHICAGO CONFERENCE.

Peter McGill of Milwaukee Strongly Approves of Its Postponement and Gives His Reasons.

COMMERCIAL CLUB, MILWAUKEE, June 16. Editor STANDARD: As one of those who intended to be present at the conference of national single tax men at Chicago on the Fourth of July, I wish to say that I heartily agree with the resolutions adopted by labor and labor club No. 1 of Chicago, at its meeting on June 7, as published in the last issue of THE STANDARD.

I had serious doubts as to the wisdom of holding the conference at the time specified, for the very reasons set forth in the resolutions of the Chicago club, but as it seemed, after a brief discussion in the columns of THE STANDARD, to be the general opinion that the conference should be held, and I was anxious that in the event of its being held it should be as numerously attended and as wisely influential as possible, I quietly set about making my arrangements to be present.

But I believed that the time was inopportune. The reasons which led me to this view were local, but I argued that what held good in Milwaukee would very likely be true in other localities.

In Milwaukee the majority of those who have given the subject of the single tax much thought are closely affiliated with the union labor party, which has a presidential candidate in the field, on a platform which, while very good in the main, ignores the single tax principle. Now these men are "enlisted for the war" in the coming campaign. Their present object is to make as good a fight as possible for their candidate along the lines set forth in their platform, and they will have neither time nor inclination to pause long enough to participate in the Chicago conference. I am not prepared to say whether in this they are right or not. That may be safely left to their own judgment. Their honesty and sincerity no one can doubt.

But I do say that I believe I have stated the position of our Milwaukee friends exactly, and I wish to repeat here what I said in a letter to Mr. Warren Wood Bailey last week, that I believe, should the convention be held, I would be the only person from this locality who would be present. And this is not because of any lack of interest in the movement. I am bound to say that it has grown beyond anything I hoped for one year ago.

And yet we have no organization, have held no formal conference and have bound ourselves by no arbitrary rules of action. We have simply worked quietly, dropping a thought here, a suggestion there, sending a STANDARD to this man and a pamphlet to that, listening our speeches, and, in as far as possible, relieving it from a partisan flavor.

This line of action we believe to be a good one, and I for one am determined to follow it until I am satisfied there is a better way. Better ways there doubt are, but I do not think the best time to develop them is in the heat and turmoil of a presidential campaign.

Let the conference be postponed if you will. I am satisfied.

PETER MCGILL.

Galveston Not Behind the Times.

GALVESTON, TEXAS, June 12.—Houston has some very good reports in the last STANDARD of glorious work going on there. Galveston is not behind the times. The single tax is progressing beyond our highest expectations. We are working it for all it is worth, and prominent business men are subscribing for the support of the movement.

All our members look very eagerly for THE STANDARD each week, and we encourage the news dealers by taking up all the old copies that are left. These papers we circulate, knowing we cannot have a better tract to put into any man's hand.

WALTER T. BONSER.

And Yet Glass Is Protected and Protection Is Declared to Keep Up Wages.

All the window glass factories in the Pittsburgh section and the west closed down last week, in accordance with a resolution adopted at a recent convention. The shut down will continue until September 1, and longer, unless the workers and employers agree on a wage scale for the next year. The former want a continuance of the present wages, while the latter claim that a reduction of from ten to twenty per cent is necessary. No trouble is expected by the workers. By the shut down about 3,000 men will be given a vacation.

A Typical Instance of the Practical Workingmen of Protective Tariffs.

There came before the senate financial committee last week Mr. R. H. Wolff, representing his own and a large number of other concerns making wire, but not making their own rods. He proved by sworn statements that the larger concerns, owning patents in the nature of a monopoly, and aided by the duty of forty-five per cent on foreign wire rods, could make a price for rods that was almost equal to the cost of the finished product. He did not ask that the duty be repealed, as he very fairly might have done, but that it be reduced from forty-five to about twenty-seven per cent. To this Mr. Oliver of Pittsburgh replied with the impudent demand that the duty be made fifty-five per cent. This is called "protection" to American labor, not only in the wire making industry but in every industry using wire in any shape, and that includes a very large variety of trades. This instance, moreover, is typical. There is hardly one "protective duty" in the whole country that does not work, in greater or less degree, precisely in this way.

PEN, PASTE AND SCISSORS.

The largest flour mill in the world will be established at Duluth. The capacity will be 6,000 barrels a day.

Word comes from Salt Lake City that the saints have bought 400,000 acres of land in the Mexican state of Chihuahua, and propose to establish there a polygamous colony of great proportions.

London has eight homes for poor working girls, at which breakfast, dinner and tea cost only a dollar a week, and a room not over a dollar more. They are said to be well managed and liberally supported by charitable people.

The lower classes of the Italian people continue to emigrate in enormous numbers, and the government is much alarmed. The number which left Genoa last year was 101,200 as against 52,323 the previous year. Most of them go to South America.

A writer in a recent book, about traveling in the east, telling of the slow pace and multitude of animals required in caravan traveling, makes the calculation that the Israelites, when they went from Egypt under Moses, must have had a caravan at least two hundred leagues long and must have employed 6,000 camels.

Leprosy is said to be spreading rapidly. Since the extension of the French colonial possessions, soldiers, sailors, traders and missionaries have fallen victims to it in large numbers. Physicians in all countries are exhorted to study closely the fell disease, in order to find means of counteracting its ravages, for it has active focuses of infection in every part of the globe.

Telegraph poles are preserved in Norway by making an auger hole about two feet from the ground, in which four or five ounces of sulphate of copper are placed, and the poles are placed and plugged in. The chemicals are actually absorbed by the wood until its whole outer surface turns of a greenish hue. The sulphate requires an occasional renewal and is said to be a perfect preservative.

Several of the French railway companies and other public bodies have resolved to have their printing done on green instead of white paper. The reason for the change is that they believe the combination of white paper with black characters endangers the eyesight of their work people. Black on green has always been recognized as a good combination, and many railway tickets are so printed.

The inspector for the Opepla district reports that out of 24,518 persons employed in mines, furnaces, salt works and turf digging, 20,517 were males and 4,001 females, thirty-two per cent of the latter being employed by the zinc furnaces. Girls are employed day and night in bringing up iron ore, and the inspector thinks it unlikely that they will be replaced by machinery, because the girls are cheaper than machines.

The two sides of the face are not alike. As a rule, says a German professor, the want of symmetry is confined to the upper part of the face. The left half of the human overeye is the right half; the nose leans a little to the right or to the left. The region of the right eye is usually slightly higher than that of the left eye, while the left eye is nearer the middle line of the countenance. The right ear is also higher, as a rule, than the left ear.

It is stated that there are more ducks in China than in all the world outside of it. They are kept on every farm, on the private roads and on all the lakes, rivers and smaller streams. There are many boats on each of which as many as 2,000 are kept. Their eggs constitute one of the most important articles of food. They are hatched in establishments fitted up for the purpose. Some of them turn out as many as 24,000 round ducks every year. Salted and smoked ducks are sold in all the towns, and many of them are exported to countries where Chinamen reside.

African teakwood is said to be so indestructible by wear or decay that vessels built of it have lasted one hundred years, to be then only broken up because of their poor sailing qualities, and even then the wood, in fact, is the most remarkable known, on account of its very great weight, hardness and durability, its weight varying from forty-two to fifty-two pounds per cubic foot. It works easily, but on account of the large quantity of oil it contains, the tools employed are quickly worn away. It also contains oil, which prevents spikes and other ironwork with which it comes in contact from rusting.

Mr. Arpad Haraszthy, in his opening address at the recent viticultural convention, estimated that there are now 150,000 acres planted in vines in California, and that 90 per cent of these are planted with the finest foreign varieties of grapes. They will not all be in full bearing for two years, when he places the product at 1,500,000 boxes of raisins, 40,000 tons of table grapes, 1,500,000 gallons of brandy and 30,000,000 gallons of wine, the total value of the crop being, in his opinion, \$16,300,000. He figures the value of the vine at 20 cents per gallon of raisins at \$2 per box, and of brandy at \$4.40 per gallon, tax paid. This makes the land planted with vines, Mr. Haraszthy considers to be \$300 per acre, or \$245,000,000. Improvements he places at \$20,000,000 thus making a total capital of \$35,000,000 invested in viticulture in California, which is an increase of \$20,000,000 in the past seven years, when only 35,000 acres of land were supposed to be planted in vines.

Dynamite consists of some porous absorbent mineral saturated with nitro-glycerine. Several substances have been tried as absorbents of the glycerine, but the most satisfactory is the kieselsol, an infusorial earth, composed of the silicious shells of extremely small vegetable organisms, and it is made that Nobel's dynamite is made. It absorbs about three times its weight of the glycerine, and resembles putty in appearance. Thus, a given

ment of
national
course, are
invest-
holders do
in any

assembled in Maine nominated me—an avowed free trader—as candidate for congress from the Second district, now represented by Nelson Dingley, jr. I at first regarded it as a forlorn hope, but now think I have a good fighting chance and shall work for it. Many

Second Political Boss (cracking a \$5 bottle of champagne)—Yal yal yal hel hel hel hel that's so.

To all who are at heart free traders I would say, try to defend no compromise measure. If you are a democrat and believe in free trade, say so unequivocally, and claim, as you are safe in claiming, that the rank and file of the democratic party are

Is not the American workman superior in acquired skill? It is a well known fact that the superior positions in American textile mills are largely held by men of foreign birth. This is so notorious that it will hardly be disputed.

the American idea which has been corrupted by the beeblers, bribers, and hangers-on about the polls; in short it was to insure a repre

doubtless do much good.

10

THE STANDARD.

HENRY GEORGE, Editor and Proprietor.

Published weekly at 2 UNION SQUARE, NEW YORK CITY.

TERMS, POSTAGE FREE. One year, \$2.50; six months, \$1.25; single copies, 5 cents. Entered at the postoffice, New York, as second class matter.

Communications and contributions are invited, and will be attentively considered. Manuscripts not found suitable for publication will be returned if sufficient stamps are sent for return postage. No notice will be taken of anonymous communications.

Contributions and letters on editorial matters should be addressed to THE EDITOR OF THE STANDARD, and all communications on business to the PUBLISHER OF THE STANDARD.

THE STANDARD wants an agent to secure subscriptions in every portion of the United States, to whom liberal terms will be given.

THE STANDARD is for sale by newsdealers throughout the United States. Persons who may be unable to obtain it will confer a favor on the publisher by notifying him promptly.

Sample copies sent free on application.

SATURDAY, JUNE 23, 1888.

THE STANDARD is forwarded to subscribers by the early morning mails each Thursday. Subscribers who do not receive the paper promptly will confer a favor by communicating with the publisher.

IT IS A FREE TRADE FIGHT.

When Governor Hill spoke for Tammany hall in ratification of the platform and nominations made at St. Louis, he said: "If it had been a free trade platform I would not be here!" In a few days the county democracy will hold their ratification meeting, and it remains to be seen whether the spokesmen of that branch of the local democracy will likewise endeavor to discredit the work of the party at large. But despite the effort of Tammany hall to face both ways, and the possibility that the county democracy may attempt the same hazardous feat, every day makes it more clear that the real leaders of the democratic party are irrevocably enlisted in the struggle against protection. Neither President Cleveland, nor the party platform, nor the party itself, is committed to the doctrine of free trade, and Daniel Dougherty might truly say even now that whoever asserts the contrary insults the intelligence of the party; but president, party, and platform are committed to opposition to the doctrine of protection, and whoever asserts the contrary insults the intelligence of all intelligent men.

Without referring to the president's message, or to its indorsement by the democratic platform, or to the Mills bill, which was prepared to give effect to the recommendations of the message, or to the galaxy of democratic statesmen, who on economic rather than fiscal grounds have defended that bill in congress, or to the tide of opinion in the democratic party so obviously rising against the notion of protection by tariffs, it is safe to say that men like Congressmen Mills, McMillen, Breckinridge and Wilson are better exponents of the dominating thought of the party than is Governor Hill or the district managers and wire pulling statesmen of Tammany hall. And from the lips of these men comes no uncertain sound. All of them spoke at the Reform club dinner last Saturday, and none of them said either directly or by innuendo that if the platform were a free trade platform they would not have been there. The question of surplus and all tariff tinkering notions they subordinated or entirely ignored in favor of the one sentiment, that all unnecessary burdens between producer and consumer should be removed.

Said Mr. Mills: "If there is a higher plane where capital can be more securely invested, where it will yield better returns, where labor will be more largely employed and receive higher wages, then it is your duty to advance and occupy that higher altitude." Referring to the contention of protectionists, "that only good results can be obtained from restricting commerce—building a sort of Chinese wall around the country," he asked why we should not stimulate commerce by carrying out this principle "to the greatest point of protection and build it around every man," so there could be no competition from foreign labor and "every man would be a Robinson Crusoe, monarch of all he surveys." He left no room to infer that the party policy stops short of abolishing protective tariffs by declaring that "the policy of Mr. Cleveland and his administration is to relieve all unnecessary burdens which exist between the producer and the consumer," and after laughing at the republican notion that America can send her products to Europe and expect cash in return he concluded in these words:

Here is the issue before you. We have got to teach our people the true position on this matter and show them that protection, instead of helping labor, destroys it. We must enlighten the minds of our laboring people on this question and show them that they should receive the full value of their wages, instead of having it diverted to the extent of forty-seven per cent to swell the enormous surplus in the treasury. When we get them to understand this question as our fathers understood it when they broke down the barriers between our states, then there will be no difficulty in handling this matter and reducing taxation to a basis sufficient for the support of the government.

Mr. McMillen of Tennessee spoke to the same effect, and C. E. Beckinridge of Arkansas cut off all suspicion that he might not have been present if the platform had been a free trade platform, when he said:

Only in the last five or six years have we seen the revival of a mediæval school of thinkers, backed now for the first time in modern times by a political party, who hold that war and the attendant consequences of war do not retard the growth and prosperity of a country, that taxation is a good thing of itself, that exchange between nations is hurtful and bad, and that the higher the

taxes and the more restrictive the embargoes upon trade the better it is for the people.

Mr. Wilson of West Virginia was no less emphatic than his associates. He described the efforts of the protectionists to make laborers believe that protection protects as the falsest of all the false pretenses that any system ever made for the purpose of blinding its followers, and pertinently asked whether the "protected" iron worker turns to the tariff to find out what wages he shall be paid, or is forced upon the labor market to get what that fixes the value of his work at, tariff or no tariff.

There can no longer be a doubt; and these speeches at the Reform club dinner are only one of many reasons for the belief that the democracy under its present leadership is bent upon destroying the system of protection that has so long fettered our commerce, fattened our monopolies, and promoted the impoverishment of our labor. It is so plain that all free traders, whatever may have been their party affiliations and however intense their hatred of the democratic machine and their contempt for its colorless policy in the past, are confronted with the imperative duty of lending to the national democratic party their hearty support in the approaching campaign. Republican success will be a temporary but disheartening defeat of the free trade principle, while democratic success will be a free trade victory, as full of promise to the white slave of today as was the election of Lincoln to the black slave of a generation ago. On the result of this election may depend the leadership of one of the two established parties—whether it shall be guided by doctrinaires like Randall, whose policy of protection is in accord with the republican party and leads to state socialism, or by statesmen like Cleveland and Mills, whose policy antagonizes that of the republicans and leads to equality of rights and individual liberty. The free trader, especially the single tax free trader, who would cast aside such an opportunity of dividing the two great parties on issues relating to labor and wages, and of saturating the politics of the future with economic thought, is more an enemy of the principles he professes than is the avowed protectionist.

THE TARIFF REDUCTION BILL.

The committee of the whole of the house of representatives made some progress last week with the tariff bill as it came from the committee of ways and means. As the republicans insist on debating each line, and take a wide range in discussion, the progress is necessarily slow. The same old assertions are made about the influence of the tariff on the wages of labor, and there is practically little new in the discussion. It becomes clearer from day to day that the minority has no other object than to delay the final vote on the measure. The debate has thus far been confined to the clauses putting certain articles on the free list, and the expectation remains that after the tariff articles are reached the work will go on more rapidly. As the political campaign will practically be opened by the placing of the republican candidates for president and vice-president in the field, it is probable that the republican members of congress will soon find other opportunities for political activity, and cease their dilatory tactics.

One feature of the debate during last week was the reading of letters from protected manufacturers protesting against putting articles in which they are peculiarly interested on the free list. These letters abounded in wailing predictions of disaster to follow the cheapening of the prices of commodities to those engaged in other industries or to the people generally, and on the republican side of the house no voice was raised in behalf of the large number of industries and individuals to be benefited by the proposed changes. The democrats are making fewer speeches and steadily pressing each line of the bill to a vote, and on each vote they are successful by a fair and almost unvarying majority. Probably the most important contribution to the debate last week was the admission of Mr. Bayne, republican, of Pennsylvania, who said:

It is perfectly evident to the members of this house, and it must now be evident to the people of the country, that this bill as reported from the committee will pass the house of representatives if the democratic party can muster the votes to put it through. It must be perfectly evident to the people of the country that they are to have this bill substantially in its present form. I believe that the only modifications proposed and agreed upon by the committee of ways and means are certain inconsequential amendments.

This admission, coming from a prominent protectionist, will be reassuring to those friends of tariff reduction who felt some natural alarm lest the concessions made by the committee for the purpose of gaining additional votes for the bill had materially weakened it as a measure looking toward free trade. If the amendments are, as Mr. Bayne declares, "inconsequential," free traders will not be disposed to severely criticize the committee of ways and means for its concessions.

The most remarkable feature of the proceedings last week was the determined effort of the protectionists to prevent the placing of tin plates on the free list. No such exhibition of irrational bigotry has been made before by the republicans. They admitted that no tin plates are now manufactured in this country, and that they are, to a numerous body of manufacturers, practically raw material, and yet they insisted that all the fruit and meat preservers, tinware manufacturers and tin roofers should be subjected to a senseless duty of thirty-five per cent on these plates for apparently no other reason than to protect the tinning of plates in this country, provided some persons yet

unknown should decide to engage in that industry, in the event of the Dakota tin mines turning out better than there is at present any reason to expect. The preposterous declaration was also made that the free admission of tin plates would run the sheet iron rolling mills, apparently by injuring the business of a smaller number of people engaged in making a poor iron roof that is only substituted for the tin because of the high price put on the latter by the tariff.

The whole discussion on this subject shows that the high tariff delusion has become a mere unreasoning superstition, founded on neither fact nor argument, and as unassailable by argument as a savage's belief in his fetish. The republican attitude on this question shows that there is no real desire to correct the most stupid inequalities and absurdities in the existing tariff, and that despite the declaration in their platform of four years ago, they are determined that no change shall be made that will lower duties on any article, no matter how great the surplus in the treasury may grow. This, at least, is the attitude of the great majority of the eastern republicans, and if their western brethren desire a different policy, they will have to get outside of the republican party in order to carry out their views. Those western congressmen who have not already broken loose from the policy of their party in the house are now being swept along into senseless opposition to all tariff reduction.

COLORADO "OVERCROWDED."

The Denver Evening Times devotes nearly two columns to a report on the condition of labor in Colorado, which shows that that youthful state is already "overcrowded." One employment agency tells the reporter that they have found work for about 150 men recently and turned away from six to seven hundred. The manager of another agency says that the rate of wages there is now lower than it is in New York, and he advises outsiders to stay away unless they have money to invest in real estate. Another complains that some unprincipled persons in the east are circulating a report that teamsters can get three dollars a day in Colorado, whereas the fact is that they cannot get more than twenty dollars a month. Complaint is also made by the citizens generally that they are overrun by tramps, and a local report shows that on one day thirty and on the next day forty of these walking monuments to the efficacy of the protection of American industry were arrested for vagrancy in the city of Denver. The reporter testifies that many of these men are really willing to work, but that they can find nothing to do.

Eastern people, accustomed to what we call "overcrowding" here, may not at first take in the full significance of this statement. In 1880 the population of Colorado was less than two to the square mile, and its population has probably not doubled since that date. Think of it! A fertile state with great agricultural and mineral resources "overcrowded" with a population of four or five persons to the square mile! Migration to such a state ought to be the natural remedy for low wages in the east, and it ought to have the effect of securing good wages to those who migrate, but the land monopoly that shuts out men from natural opportunities for self employment, and the tariff that smotheres and strangles agriculture, have done their perfect work and Colorado is "overcrowded." Yet Colorado is represented in congress by men who uphold the party that so eagerly gave away the public domain to railway corporations and who insist on maintaining the tariff to further burden Colorado farmers. What a farce it is to talk of protection to American industry by a system that crowds the workman of the older settled portions of the country to the wall and refuses him escape to the industries of the sea while it closes against him the fertile plains of the west, "overcrowded" by a population of four or five to the square mile.

NOTHING TO DO.

The Western steel works at St. Louis have ceased operations. This announcement is made by the Pittsburgh Chronicle-Telegraph with the ominous statement that the works are not to begin operations again "until the fate of the Mills bill is decided," and that meantime the 1,500 employes whom the stoppage throws out of work will remain idle; all of which is due to "the disturbing effects of this bill." What an opportunity was lost to the protectionists when that sturdy and luxurious exemplar of the benefits of protection, Mr. Carnegie, closed his works before the Mills bill had an opportunity to get in its "disturbing effects"? Why did he not wait?

The Chicago fire was a godsend to many a bankrupt, who, after tottering for months on the slippery edge of insolvency, was able to point his creditors to the lurid flames and smoldering ruins of Chicago as the cause of his downfall. So manufacturers whose business falls a victim to the long era of protection which has made of them catspaws for landlords, are held up as awful examples of the effect of the Mills bill. The point of the argument is in its suggestion that free trade would throw men out of employment and keep them in idleness. The mere introduction of a partial free trade measure closes a big factory and deprives 1,500 men of work. Its passage would make less work still. The introduction of an outright free trade measure would cause more factories to close, and its passage would leave no work at all to be done. It would be like a self constructing, self operating, self repairing, universal wealth producing machine.

If protectionists take the American peo-

ple for fools, they are not to be blamed; the assumption is justified, since that kind of stuff has been made to do duty for argument all these years, and to walk without limping and stare without winking through all the literature with which protection leagues have deluged us. But if any of these fools *prima facie* will stop long enough to think, he will know—it will not be an inference, he will know it—that free trade, instead of diminishing demand for products, will increase it, and that less manufacturing in the face of higher demand is a simple impossibility.

Free trade makes less work necessary to produce a given result, just as machinery does; but when that is followed by the impoverishment of any one it is not because free trade engenders poverty, but because natural opportunities for work are dearer—because another and more fundamental form of protection asserts itself.

Mr. George F. Elliott of Stamford, Conn., is the Press's latest witness for protection. Mr. Elliott has met a man—an English tourist—and having obtained his views on the great tariff question hastens to give them to the world through the tariff talker of the Press. Here is the testimony:

"What wages do you earn in England?" "From \$3 to \$9 per week. While here I could earn for the same work from \$15 to \$18."

"Is there much difference in the condition of the workingmen here and those in your country?" "A vast deal of difference. You have better homes, better food and better clothing. In fact, you people here in America don't want free trade or anything like it. I am not very well posted in your political affairs, but I am sure that what you do want here is a protective tariff."

Unfortunately, however, the honesty of the tariff talker is greater than his discretion. He not only gives us these opinions of the tourist, but he also communicates some facts regarding his personal history and condition, which, in a measure, detract from the value of his evidence. It appears that he was a cotton presser by trade, had been in the country for seven weeks without being able to get work at his trade or anything else, and described himself as being "not exactly on the tramp, but looking for work."

"I landed at Boston with about \$60 in my pocket, and have spent my time here at Pawtucket, Lowell, Providence and several other places where they have mills, but could get no work."

"What is the reason they gave for not employing you?" "They one and all said that the tariff agitation was causing a great depression in business, and they further say that if the no tariff bill passes your congress they will have to shut down entirely."

Perhaps, on the whole, the tariff talker had better call the next witness.

The Philadelphia Times claims that "we have too much of mineral raw material to make it judicious for us to build a wall around this country." So we have. Coal, iron, gold, silver, petroleum, copper, lime, salt, stone, natural gas, and so on through a long list; our land is full of them. They require but labor to bring them forth, labor to make the machinery to aid in bringing them forth, labor to transport them, and freedom to exchange them for raw material that our country does not offer, or finished products which we do not wish to make. To build a tariff wall around the country is to diminish the output of these minerals and to contract opportunities for employment in producing and transporting them and working them up. But a tariff wall around the mines is just as bad as a tariff wall around the country. There can be no real free trade in raw materials so long as the source of raw materials, the earth itself, is private property.

Every now and again we hear manufacturers complain that free trade would destroy their business. Manufacturers are pretty good calculators. They note the cost of materials, interest on capital, rent, wages, and so forth and so on, omitting not the smallest item, when considering the details of their business. But when considering the abolition of tariff they think only of the removal of duties from their own product, giving no thought to the fact that free trade abolishes duties on materials as well as on products. Every manufacturer can judge the effect of free trade on his business with fair accuracy, if he will take into the computation, first, the reduced prices at which he can sell at a profit if he gets his materials free, and second, the greater number of sales he could make if he sold at the lower prices which free trade would permit.

The Pittsburgh Chronicle-Telegraph thinks "the best thing the democrats can do is to repeal the internal revenue taxes and let everything else alone," and it does not believe that Congressman Dougherty will live to see the enactment of his proposed law taxing all personal and corporate incomes above \$5,000 a year. To repeal the internal revenue laws is not the best thing the democratic party can do, but it is a good thing to do, all the same. The internal revenue laws, like the protective tariff laws, are burdens upon industry, promoting monopolies, subjugating labor, and forcing down wages; but the internal revenue laws are to the protective tariff laws as a Lilliputian to a Brobdingnagian. The best thing the democratic party can do just now, therefore, is to repeal the tariff laws, and not let everything else alone, but go right along from point to point until the whole system of protection, internal and external, is done away with. And in doing this Mr. Dougherty's plan of taxing incomes need not and should not be adopted. That method is in line with the protection idea. It is part of the socialistic fungus of which protective tariffs are roots and suckers. The un-

qualified right of enjoying private property must be secured and maintained, and that right is not and never will be secured while whatever any man honestly earns is confiscated by taxation.

The Evening News of Detroit finds in the nomination of Thurman reason to believe that the democrats may carry Michigan. Thurman is in principle a "greenbacker," though he never belonged to the greenback party. He was one of the many leading men of the country whose influence in favor of the greenback idea was destroyed by third party men who persisted in making fealty to a mere organization the test of loyalty to a principle. It is from the gratification which Thurman's nomination gives to the greenback contingent of Michigan that the News expects democratic success in that state. It prophesies that the forty odd Thurman votes cast there for Butler in 1884 will now be cast for Thurman. In this it is probably mistaken. Some of those votes were partisan votes which this year will be cast for Streeter, the union labor candidate, and some were those of protectionists that this year will be cast for the republican ticket. But respecting the greater proportion of them the News is no doubt right. And besides this proportion of Butler's vote which will go to Thurman because he is a greenbacker, the Thurman ticket will receive a large greenback vote which did not go to Butler. In Michigan, as in all other states of the Union, very much the larger part of the greenback vote was not cast for Butler in 1884, nor for the greenback ticket in any year. This fact the News overlooks in putting the New York greenback vote at less than a thousand. That was what was cast in 1886, but it was cast by men who take pride "in standing up to be counted," very much as raw soldiers take pride in useless exposure, to their own discomfiture and the possible ruin of their cause. That "greenbackers" who understand the principle which that term designates and its relations in practical politics, and who are not mere tin pan drummers and builders of toy parties, will support Thurman in this contest, there is good reason to believe. Those of them who are free traders—and it is difficult to understand how an intelligent greenbacker can be a protectionist—will certainly support him. This campaign is one of economic issues, and as it goes on will draw the line between fallacious doctrines and sound principles with greater and greater clearness.

In his excellent speech at the Reform club dinner, Mr. Stokes, the president of the club, illustrating the truth that whatever makes things scarce and dear must injure workmen, said: "If the skies rained down bread and clothing and groceries, this would benefit the poor." This illustration shows how close to the tariff question lies the still greater land question, and may give Mr. Stokes, if he thinks of it, an idea of what the real root of the protective fallacy. In a country like this the raining down of food, clothing and groceries might for awhile be of some benefit to the poor. But not so in a country such as this is rapidly getting to be, where land is all monopolized. How long in such a country would even the raining down of food, clothing and groceries benefit the poor man? He might have a chance for a scramble on the highway, provided adjacent property owners did not claim the privilege, and he might have the benefit of the parks until the city closed the gates and sold the fee. But wherever else the bread and clothing and groceries fell they would belong to the owner of the land. If the workingman wanted to buy land he would find the speculative price very high before a shower and the real price very high after a shower.

It ought to be a good thing for all men if bread, clothing and groceries were rained down from the sky, and it would be so if our laws did not make the surface of the planet the private and exclusive property of only some of the people who live upon it, so that the whole benefit of the shower must accrue to the owners of the places where it fell. But the remedy for this does not consist in praying against such rainfalls; it consists in letting the skies rain as much bread, clothing and groceries as they will, and abolishing the unjust laws which give to the few what nature provides for all. So with free trade. When Mr. Stokes gets to the point of realizing this, then will he become a free trader in a fuller, truer sense than he ever was before, and be able to point out to workingmen the real cause of evils, to check which they vainly turn to protection.

Bread, clothing, and groceries will never be rained from the sky, but the same thing occurs in principle when minerals are discovered in the earth; when labor saving machinery is invented, when cities cheapen production by focusing exchanges. If these things do not benefit workmen and raise wages, it is only because land is monopolized.

Censuring a Rochester Assemblyman for Voting Against the Electoral Reform Bill.

At the last meeting of the Rochester united labor club, the following resolutions condemning the local assemblyman and approving of Assemblyman McNaughton for their actions regarding the electoral reform bill were passed:

Resolved, That we, the members of the united labor club, unreservedly condemn the action of our assemblyman, the Hon. F. A. Sullivan, and that we hereby pledge ourselves to use every means in our power to secure the election next fall of any man who will stand squarely upon the plank of electoral reform; further,

Resolved, That we rejoice to find the Hon.

D. McNaughton, almost alone in his party, rise above the level of the politician and place himself on record as favoring a change in our electoral system which will insure pure government and honest politics, both state and national.

THE BEATING OF THE DRUMS.

The platform adopted by the democratic national convention to day means free trade without a syllable of qualification.—[Minneapolis Evening Journal.]

The modern "trust" is simply a monopolistic tariff of tax levied upon the people, the poor and insolence of combined capital, and enforced by the law's necessities, for the benefit of greedy money sharks.—[Rhode Island Democrat.]

As the Herald has many times repeated, the parties—so as they may, retreat as they may, harmonize as they may—cannot keep the issue of high tax or low tax from the polls. On that line the battle will be fought.—[Chicago Herald.]

The democratic platform, as was expected, has a big free trade plank "inforcing the views expressed by President Cleveland in his last annual message as the correct interpretation of that platform upon the question of tariff reduction." Could anything be plainer? Assuredly not.—[Philadelphia News (Rep).]

How little of protection and how much of free trade the democratic platform contains can easily be gathered from the debates in congress and the comments in the press of the country. What protection is there in it for wool, lumber and other articles placed upon the free list?—[Pittsburg Commercial-Gazette.]

Every poor man should rejoice that Pennsylvania has never taken a tariff of roses off the free list. There is no tariff on a star of roses. A poor man may buy a bouquet of attar of roses every day if he desires it. He may have to put his children in coffee sacks, but he cannot complain that his perfumery is taxed.—[Courier-Journal.]

The Herald is for that protection which gives the people cheap clothes, cheap shoes, cheap hats, cheap blankets and the necessities of life cheap. There is no tariff on a party that stands for the old war tariff, which continually grinds down the masses for the benefit of the rich monopolists of the country.—[Massachusetts, Ill. Herald.]

Upon the merits of the tariff issue the democratic party will either stand or fall in the coming battle. For once in its history the party finds itself to face with that momentous problem, and henceforth will stand before the American people as the champion of tariff reform and ultimate free trade.—[Richmond County, N. Y., Advance.]

Where's the difference? Puddlers were paid \$3.20 per ton under what was called the "free tariff" of 1846. They are now paid \$3.50 per ton under the proposed protective tariff of sixty per cent. Yes, there is a difference. Under tariff of 1846 the cost of living to the puddler was at least a third less than it is now.—[Mauch Chunk, Pa., Democrat.]

We believe that this year will see such a revolt among American workmen against the idea of "protection" as has never been seen before. Those who argue that the sensible workmen of the country are blindly enslaved to protected masters and are incapable of seeing the truth grossly insult their intelligence.—[Richmond, Va., State.]

Labor needs to be protected in the enjoyment of its wages; but its right to invest these wages in accordance with its wishes, without paying tribute to organized capital, is systematically denied under a war tariff; and as the most prudent method of protecting labor, democrats propose to reduce war taxation and deliver labor from the oppression of capital.—[Louisville Courier-Journal.]

Protection does not make food cheap. The farmers are the food producers, and protection adds to the cost of nearly everything the farmer has to buy. Protection does not increase wages, because the laborer competes with all comers in the open market in the sale of his labor. He gets higher wages because he earns them by better, more rapid and more efficient work.—[Sandusky, O., Journal and Local.]

The rank and file of all parties also demand and will vote for a judicious revision of the present unjust, unwarranted and destructive tariff, while the class who live by other people's work only are buying and driving all that money can control, or other influence savoring from supporting their own interests and that of the great west generally. But the masses are organizing more thoroughly and the would be lords will be buried with their paid minions in the slough of political degradation so deep that no resurrection will be attempted.—[West La Crosse, Minn., Co-operator.]

The fact that was most clearly and emphatically made manifest to all observers at St. Louis was that the popular demand for a material reduction in the tariff taxes upon the necessities of life and the raw materials of manufacture is the strongest demand of the time. The conviction of this necessity is shared alike by those who are free traders in doctrine and by those who hold firmly to the protectionist principle; by those who represent agricultural constituencies and those whose constituents are mainly engaged in manufacturing industries; by men of the east, the west, the north and the south.—[New York Commercial Advertiser (Rep).]

The Millionaire's Advice.

San Francisco Chronicle. A millionaire's advice is always sound and good—if you can take it. But a millionaire's advice is generally based upon the assumption that you can take it; and it is always the kind of advice you can't take.

"Buy a little home, my dear boy; buy a little home for your wife and family, and then you are safe."

I heard a rich man advise a poor man to that effect.

"Did that," answered the poor man quietly, "many years ago."

"That was wise. You are safe for some time if you have bought a goodly tract of land."

"Yes, I bought a home, and it's mortgaged to you."

"O, well, that's the trouble with so many. They want to speculate, and they borrow money. Never lend money on credit security. You may be called stingy because you won't lend a man fifty cents, but it's a question of principle. Never borrow money. Never do."

"If you will be so kind, you are hopelessly wrong. You'll find yourself kept back all your life. Now, ever since I began I have kept to that rule, and now I'm worth several millions."

"You have been a hard working man, it is creditable to you that you are so rich."

"Poor! You bet I did. I hadn't a cent in the world, and I borrowed a dollar."

"Eh?"

"Well, of course. I don't mean—that was different."

But Why Take Even Twenty Per Cent Out of the Pockets of Consumers?

Chicago Tribune.

MEN AND THINGS.

A hundred years ago Count Mirabeau epigrammatically said that there were but three ways of acquiring wealth,—by work, by gift, or by theft. A man who wants a thing must either make it, buy it, beg it, or steal it.

Modern ingenuity, however, has found another way of getting hold of property—at least, when the property desired is a railway, or a mine, or anything else belonging to a stock corporation. Like most other great discoveries, it's a very simple matter—when you understand it.

For example, here is the Richmond terminal company, a corporation owning in its own right a short and valuable piece of railroad, but controlling a large extent of connecting roads under lease. The problem is to get possession of the Richmond terminal property. The uninitiated would say that the only thing to be done is to buy at least a majority of the stock of the company from those who own it. The initiated, however, laugh at that method as soon, and adopt an easier plan. They wait until the time draws near when the transfer books of the company will be closed, previous to the annual election of directors. Then they hire them to Wall Street, borrow a sufficient quantity of the stock for a day or two, have it registered in their own names, return it to the owner, with a bonus for its use, and when the day of election comes, vote themselves into control of a property in which they have, it may be, not a dollar of actual interest. It goes without saying that this method is not always absolutely sure of success, since when two or more parties want to get control of the same property the owners of stock may demand an exorbitant price for the lending of it; but that it has been practiced, and to an alarmingly great extent, is matter of common fame in Wall Street.

How to put an end to this sort of thing is a question which the governing committee of the stock exchange are now considering. The matter was brought to their attention by a letter from one firm of brokers, complaining that another firm of brokers had borrowed from them a thousand shares of Richmond terminal stock, and used it in the manner described, at the recent annual election of directors. When the lenders of the stock received it back they found it had been registered in the name of the borrowers, and when they applied to the latter for a proxy to enable them to vote at the election, they were informed that "according to usage on the stock exchange no proxy is due on stock borrowed over the closing of the books."

It seems by no means certain that the stock exchange committee can do anything to remedy this, for any regulation they may make will be easily evaded if both parties are willing to evade it. It is already a statutory crime, punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, for any person to vote on stock of which he is not either the actual owner or the representative of the owner; and any inspector of election, at the annual meeting of any New York corporation, may require any proxy holder to swear, under penalty of perjury, that the person he represents is, to the best of his knowledge, the bona fide owner of the stock voted on. It would be difficult for the stock exchange to pass a more stringent law than this, or to enforce it with a severe penalty.

The simple truth is that neither a legislature nor a governing committee can make men virtuous by mere prohibitory enactments. If public sentiment attaches no stigma of disgrace to the doing of something which men find it profitable to do, that thing will continue to be done, all the laws on the statute book to the contrary notwithstanding; and the only effect of the most stringent law will be to make men skillful in concealment. Thus usury laws become dead letters, excise laws are openly violated, and men, who in all ordinary relations of life are absolutely truthful, calmly perjure themselves to evade the robbery of the protective tariff. If the stock exchange people want to put an end to such questionable methods of acquiring property as that we have described, they must make it scandalous for men to use them. And that they can never do so long as the greed of gain is fostered and men are urged to the pursuit of wealth by that social injustice which decrees that out of every thousand American citizens born into this country a certain number must, of necessity, pass their lives in poverty.

Who was it that invented, years ago, the fiction of the lawyer who, being consulted by a client who had embezzled a comparatively trifling sum, advised him to take as much as he could lay hands on, compromise matters by returning a portion, and keep the balance? The story used to be thought ingenious, but absurd. Yet it is what has actually happened in the case of the defaulting paying teller of the Manhattan company and his counsel. The former having pilfered from the bank sums aggregating about \$10,000, went to Lawyer Dunn for advice. Dunn examined authorities, thought the matter over, and then advised Mr. Scott to take a million and flee—"take enough to cripple the bank, so that they'll be glad to compromise," was Dunn's expression. Scott took the advice in part, stole \$160,000, gave the most of it to Dunn to take care of for him, and vanished into Canada, whence he shortly went to London.

Then a curious situation developed itself. The defaulter in London was urgently trying to get some money out of Lawyer Dunn, who was, after a fashion, trustee for all concerned. The Manhattan company also wanted money, and showed a charitable disposition to condone Scott's offense if only he would pay some reasonable sum, say, \$50,000 to \$60,000. And Lawyer Dunn, rising to the possibilities of the occasion, announced that he had lost the money, and defied everybody. This was shortsighted of Mr. Dunn, and illustrated the truth of the proverb about the man who tries to be his own lawyer. For the bank, finding it impossible to get any money out of anybody, was eager for revenge; and Mr. Scott, finding it impossible for him to get any money, became rather anxious than otherwise to

sacrifice Mr. Dunn upon the altar of justice. And so the end of it all is that ex-ter Scott is free but penniless, lawyer Dunn is a convict but comparatively rich, and the Manhattan company has had the satisfaction of getting square to a certain extent. It is a very pretty episode of modern commercial life.

For observe, that the Manhattan officials are only less guilty than the other criminals. They have deliberately attempted to compound a felony. Had Dunn been willing to surrender \$50,000 of the money in his hands he might be a free man to-day. And indeed it seems not at all unlikely that he has deliberately chosen to serve his term in prison rather than give up any of the cash. That he should have had the option is the fault of the Manhattan company.

Chauncey M. Depew, while on his way to the Chicago convention, stopped over at Syracuse to deliver an address before the graduating class of the medical college of that city. Mr. Depew's speeches are always pleasant to read, if only for the shrewd humor in them; but this particular address is especially interesting, because in it the speaker turned the serious side of his nature outward, and showed the world how the life problems of this nineteenth century present themselves to a man who in his own person has achieved a marked success—who has not only conquered fortune and become rich, but has also managed to acquire the respect and esteem of his fellow citizens in a naked degree.

In the very beginning of his address, Mr. Depew compressed into a single paragraph a whole encyclopedia of economics.

The vocation chosen by a young man is governed often by accident than inclination. But the manner in which it is pursued is controlled neither by luck nor chance. The liberal professions are crowded with incompetents. I know ministers who should be palace car conductors, poor lawyers who would have been good drummers or clerks, and medical men who are more dangerous to their patients than the disease they treat, who were designed by nature for the farm or the factory. The world is a workshop full of misfits, and misfits are always cheap. It requires both faculty and courage when you have discovered your mistake to drop your tools and start again. But if all the doctors, lawyers and ministers who never can get on in their professions would get out and find other fields of labor, it would be infinitely better for themselves and the country. A living stream of new applicants for public favor and support pours through the portals of the schools of medicine, law and theology. It is estimated that doctors are thus manufactured in such large numbers that they form one to every three hundred inhabitants. At first view this seems very discouraging, but the situation has many compensations. So many are wholly unfit or badly prepared, that while they increase the miseries of mankind, they add to the business and profits of those who are capable. The competitions of modern life have become so keen that there are no opportunities for the lame and the lazy. The first must find their proper pursuits, and the second must work or go to the wall.

This is all very fine; but it tempts one to ask what the lame man is to do who can find no room in his proper pursuit, and what the lazy man is to do when nobody will furnish him with work. Mr. Depew must know full well that there are myriads of men who would gladly be palace car conductors, or drummers, or clerks, or farmers, or factory hands, and are sufficiently well qualified for those callings, but who are absolutely shut out from them by a decree as inexorable as the laws of the Medes and Persians. And why should a young man, in choosing his vocation, be governed by accident rather than inclination? Why should the boy beginning life be compelled to ask, "What can I get to do?" rather than, "What can I do best?" These are questions which apparently find no place in Mr. Depew's economic philosophy. But they are questions that demand an answer all the same.

This little anecdote and the comment on it which Mr. Depew interjected into his address show how clearly he understands the bottom principle of protection.

In no state or country has the progress of your profession been more remarkable than in New York. While searching the records of this Dutch colony for another purpose, I found this historically valuable entry under date of February 5, 1652:

"The colonial council order that ships' doctors arriving at the port of New Amsterdam shall not be permitted to practice medicine or surgery without the consent of Dr. La Montaigne." The good doctor was the only physician on Manhattan island. Orders of the council were equivalent to statutes, and this was the first law for the protection of American industry ever passed on this continent. In the midst of the heated controversies of the hour on this great question, you gentlemen may congratulate yourselves that the father of American medicine was also the founder of our protective system. One hundred years after, in 1755, King's college, in New York, had a medical department, and Dr. John Jones, its professor of surgery, published a work upon field hospitals and the treatment of the wounded, which was the text book of the staff during the revolutionary war, and his suggestions were adopted by the army surgeon of the veteran armies of Europe. Now it is the just pride of our state that its medical colleges in equipment and instruction compare favorably with the world famed schools of Vienna, London and Paris.

Evidently Mr. Depew is satisfied that Dr. John Jones's text book would never have been written, and still less would our medical colleges have been comparable with those of Europe, had not Dr. La Montaigne been protected in his monopoly of practice on Manhattan island. This opens up a whole vista of possibilities. If our medical profession will only have the good sense to cut loose from the rest of the world altogether—to forbid the importation of foreign doctors, foreign drugs and foreign medical works and periodicals, absolutely, to what dizzy heights of healing may they not attain? Indeed, on this principle, Podunk Four Corners, with its single doctor, may become a center of medical science, by the simple process of forbidding any other physician to settle within its limits.

St. Louis is to have a charity organization society of its own—a central bureau to which kindly disposed citizens can refer cases of distress and applicants for alms. Registry books are to be opened, in which the names of applicants for relief will be entered with the report of the association's inspectors on each case. In this way it is

expected that the pauper class will be thoroughly sifted, the undeserving left to starve, and the meritorious poor relieved to just that moderate extent that will keep them from perishing, without making life too pleasant for them. Several clergymen, two or three local missionaries and a few philanthropic ladies are among the organizers, and the wealthy citizens of St. Louis are being actively canvassed for members.

It is a queer comment on modern Christianity that the ministers of Him who bade his followers do their alms in secret, not letting their right hands know the gifts bestowed with their left, should find it necessary to uphold and even to join such an organization as this. It makes one wonder whether the character of the alms-seeking class has changed in the last eighteen hundred years, or whether this precept of the Master, like his utterances from the Mount, is to be accepted with the reservation that He didn't mean what He said. The teaching that the poor we have always with us is accepted as a sufficiently explicit condemnation of any effort to abolish poverty; but when it comes to relieving the distresses of the poor, it appears that modern wisdom must supplement the new testament, and that to obey the letter of the scripture would be to strike a blow at the foundations of society.

This, however, is a matter which the charity organizers must settle with their own consciences. If the modern good Samaritan, instead of oil and wine, chooses to give the sufferer by the wayside a ticket on the Samaritan organization society, he has a perfect right to do so. But it may be suggested to the advocates of charity organization that their methods are very apt to be self defeating; and that in endeavoring to separate the deserving from the undeserving they may be really placing a premium upon deception, just as a custom house offers a reward for successful perjury. To an adroit and calculating swindler, system in charity may be a help rather than a hindrance. He knows just what dangers he has to provide against or avoid, and can lay his plans accordingly. It is, in fact, an application of the competitive examination principle, in which the reward is an easy living at other people's cost.

And yet the organizers of the St. Louis society are, most of them at least, no doubt sincerely good and earnest men and women. The distress they see about them troubles them, and will not let them rest. They feel they must do something; they know by experience that indiscriminate alms giving is the fruitful parent of pauperism; and they organize their charity because that seems the only thing left for them to do. To tell them that no amount of alms giving, no efficiency of organization, can do more than to lift some men out of poverty at the cost of thrusting other men into poverty, would seem to them like blasphemy. For in spite of all their misinterpretations of economic and religious principles, they instinctively revolt against the pretense that God, or nature, or the fitness of things, demands that men shall live in poverty whether they will or no. Confronted with the grim social paradox, they turn away their faces, and muttering that it cannot be, refuse to gaze upon the horrid thing. But it is not by such avoiding of the question that the problem of poverty is to be solved.

If these good men and women would but have the courage to question their own experience they would soon discover the uselessness of mere alms giving, whether organized or sporadic. What the poor need is not to have their wants relieved by charity, but to have the restrictions removed that prevent them relieving themselves. Robbed of their heritage of the right of access to natural opportunities, they lack wealth simply because they are not allowed to produce it. The way to make them self dependent is to undo the social crime that forces them to depend on others for the privilege of work, or the gratuity of food and clothing and shelter if work cannot be given them. Let the organizers of charity turn down the heels of monopoly and give men the privilege of applying their labor to the raw materials of nature and of enjoying the full reward of their toil, and the whole system of charity registers, patrons, visitors and detectives will vanish for want of occupation.

The citizens of Bangor, Maine, are worried over the arrival in their city of several hundred Italians who have been swindled by some clever sharper in New York into paying a double fare to Bangor on the promise of steady work and good pay when they should arrive there. The steady work is a myth, the good pay is not forthcoming, and the people of Bangor find themselves burdened with a lot of foreigners who are, indeed, quite willing to work, but who show unmistakably by their actions that if they can't get work they will steal before they'll starve.

Of course, it is a sad thing that men should be swindled in this way; and it is pity of the Bangor people, too, who find themselves thus confronted with a social problem in very concrete form. But after all, the wrong inflicted on these poor Italians is only a type of the wrong which society inflicts on the vast majority of American citizens. There is no lack of room for these men in the state of Maine—no lack of natural opportunities to which they could apply their labor for the production of wealth. But the people who own the natural opportunities don't want them transmuted into wealth just at present; and so these hundreds of willing hands must remain idle, or find occupation in stealing. And as it is in Maine, so it is in New York and everywhere else where the blight of private ownership of natural resources has fallen on the land.

The Paris papers tell a queer story of the development of a new industry in France. This is nothing less than an express system for the transportation of goods from Paris to Italy without the payment of duties. The association charges according to the value of the goods transported, and guarantees safe delivery, having its own methods of avoiding custom house complications. In a single day packages to the value of \$100,000 were received and forwarded, the charges on which were \$7,500. The enterprise has so far been com-

pletely successful, not a single package having been lost by seizure.

At the recent annual meeting of the Land nationalization society of Great Britain, the president, Alfred Russell Wallace, epitomized the British industrial situation as follows:

It is about fifty years since Hood's famous "Song of the Shirt" startled the world with its revelation of hopeless misery. But what would Hood have said if he could have heard the revelations now being made—of shirts made at id. each, the worker, by continuous hard work, making twelve shirts a day, and earning 6s. a week, and with the rest of an attic at least, double what it was in his time! Five years ago we had the "bitter cry" excitement, and a commission of inquiry, and a huge report. Then another commission on depression of trade and another report—and now another commission or committee on the "sweating system"—to be followed no doubt by another report, which, like the preceding reports, will be simply so much waste paper. The reason why commissions and reports do no good is because our politicians and our philanthropists will never search for real causes, will never go to the root of the matter, which is, in one word, landlordism, that system of land monopoly which treats the land of the country as a means of profit for landlord and farmer, that profit being got with the minimum of labor on the land. An attempt is now being made to put the public on a wrong scent, by imputing all the misery of our city workers to the competition of foreigners. I do not say this has no effect; it is no doubt an aggravating cause, and so long as we cannot keep our own people from starving it should be stopped; but it is as nothing compared with the real fundamental cause—the driving of the rural population from the country to the great towns. Year after year farmers, under the pressure of the exorbitant rents of the period of commercial prosperity which culminated in 1872, are becoming first impoverished, then bankrupt, and landlords are turning their arable land into pasture, so as to get the maximum of profit with the minimum of outlay and risk, and thus a constant stream of laborers, and with them village mechanics and shop keepers, are forced to migrate to the towns. The consequence is that we have at this moment two-thirds of our whole population—more than twenty million people—concentrated in the great cities and towns, while millions of acres of our land all over the country are deserted and left uncultivated, cultivated that fifty years ago. Yet when this fact was brought before them last week by Mr. Bradlaugh, our legislators, men who profess to be our representatives, walked out of the house of commons ill, there being only fifteen members present, the debate collapsed in a count out! In the course of the debate we had the usual statement that the land was uncultivated because it could not be cultivated at a profit. No doubt the landlord, having ruined the farmers by making them pay exorbitant rents, cannot find tenants for his farms; but this very same land could be cultivated at a profit by laborers and their families, even paying the same rent as the farmers paid, if they had the land in such quantities as they required; and with absolute security of tenure. That they can and do this—cultivate it and live comfortably on it—has been shown again and again, though the fact is always denied in parliament. The reports of the agricultural commission prove it. The landlord apologist, the Hon. Mr. Broderick, proves it in his book on "English Lands and English Landlords." I myself have collected ample evidence of it in my books on "Land Nationalization" and "Red Times." It is as simple as the "Three Acres and a Cow" and his "House of Burgesses." In this last pamphlet he shows that on a farm taken by a workingmen's allotment association in Northamptonshire, forty men were employed where only four men were employed by the farmer, the result being that wheat produced forty-eight bushels an acre, nearly double the farmer's average! And this land is cultivated, not by men who have been farm laborers only, but by small tradesmen, green grocers, dairymen, mechanics, etc., showing that men brought up in the country in the midst of agriculture have both a love of it and a knowledge of it sufficient to enable them to cultivate land at a profit. Now if we could take a census of the unemployed and struggling workers in London and other great cities, we should find that perhaps one-third, perhaps half of them, were country born, and would go back to their native villages if they had a fair chance. Once throw the land open to workers, giving them the choice of a place to live in, with absolute security of tenure, and not only would the immigration to our cities be stopped, but an outflow would begin from them to the country which would have the most beneficial effects, both on the production of food, the decrease of poverty, and the progress of trade. Now this I hold to be the great purpose and use of land nationalization, to get the people back out to the land, to check the growth of great cities, and to produce on our own soil the millions sterling worth of eggs, poultry, butter, cheese, bacon, and fruit now imported, but which we can easily grow ourselves. Even the importation of wheat would be greatly diminished, for when laborers grow wheat by choice as they frequently do, we may be sure that it pays them to grow it, the reason being that they grow from 40 to 50 bushels an acre, while the farmer under a landlord grows from 20 to 30 only.

By some strange perversion of intelligence, Dr. Wallace, after thus clearly tracing the cause of poverty to the monopolization of the natural opportunities, proposes by way of remedy that the landlords, without reducing their claims for rent, should simply be required to let their agricultural land in smaller parcels! This, he thinks—or at all events, he says—would be far better than to abolish landlordism altogether by taxing land values; because, in the latter case, land would still be cultivated by farmers, who would employ as few laborers as possible, and avail themselves of the competition among laborers to keep down wages. "On the other hand, if laborers of all kinds had free access to land on the most favorable terms and conditions, they would get almost all they could get by the most thorough land nationalization, since it would not matter to them to whom they paid their rents."

This is certainly the most amazing piece of logic that was ever heard outside a lunatic asylum.

Water at a Dollar a Gallon.

Sir Oracle in Real Estate Record and Guide.

We ought to have state if not national care of all our health resorts. Private persons should not be permitted to monopolize places of resort, the great ones, as the Hot Springs at Waukesha, Wis. It is useful in kidney troubles, especially in diabetes. Time was when a barrel of it could be bought for \$5; the company who own it now charge \$10 a barrel, a gallon a quart, a quart a penny, and the famous Zinfandel wine of California. There are other springs at Waukesha, no doubt quite as healthful if they were to be analyzed and their curative properties known, as they would be in Europe.

He Recommends Everyone to Spend His Vacation in a Coaching Trip.

The Pall Mall Gazette enjoyed the privilege of an interview with Mr. Andrew Carnegie previous to his departure on his coaching trip with Mr. Blaine. Mr. Carnegie, who it seems is known in London as the Iron King, was discovered poring over a huge map of England which quite covered the table.

Telegrams were dropping in at short intervals from all parts of the country, containing mysterious messages about beds and lunches: scores of road maps bound in neat little covers were ranged on an *escritoire*, and there was an air of healthy excitement among the ladies, which affected us long before Mr. Carnegie, who wears his crown very easily. Those who have been fortunate enough to see the fiery regions over which he rules away over the Allegheny mountains, or to contemplate the great armies of millions, which he is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has suggested, which is the general and commander in chief, will wonder that his enormous responsibilities do not crush all pleasure out of him. On the contrary, nothing seems to affect the Iron King, who assured me that it was quite a matter to conduct the affairs even of a fiery kingdom peopled by vulcans from any part of the civilized world, provided that the wires were in good working order. "The coach starts on Thursday at four, and we have a good time," said Mr. Carnegie, when we sat down to talk over this remarkable coaching trip. "I am using the same coach as I had last year, plus a number of little improvements which experience has

LOUIS PRANG.

A PROTECTED MANUFACTURER WHO DE-
CLARES FOR FREE TRADE.

And Plans Himself Upon the American
Doctrine of Equal Rights and No Favors.

Louis Prang, the great Boston manufacturer of fine colored lithographs and oil prints, stands at the head of his business in this country, if not in the world. His energy, industry and fine artistic instinct have enabled him not only to build up a manufacture, which, in some of its branches, is unequalled even in Europe, but to do much to popularize the taste for art. Instead of joining in the ranks of the lithographers for more protection, Mr. Prang has written a letter to the *American Lithographer and Printer*, in which, both as a manufacturer and an American citizen, he declares against protection in toto. As to his own business, Mr. Prang says:

Does any one believe that with our intelligence, our skill, our energy, our printing presses, we are not a match for all Europe as far as the great bulk of the business is concerned? Free trade prices of materials and machinery would add considerably to our ability, not only to hold, but to increase our markets.

The foreign manufacturers of goods similar to those which I produce have always under-sold me in this market, and yet my business has prospered. I saw that European manufacturers did not understand all the requirements of this market, and that there was an opportunity for me to make a line of goods that should be distinctively American. Instead, therefore, of undertaking to imitate what was well done in Europe and then expect the government to protect me in my imitations, I appealed to American intelligence, to American skill, and to American artists for original work, and thus built up a business independent of protection, and have sold my goods largely in foreign markets by reason of their individual qualities. My business, therefore, has had no help from protection; it has been built up in spite of protection, and if our protective policy had not to a certain extent shut me out of the markets of the world by artificially enhancing the cost of my products, and by largely abrogating the inter-communication with distant nations, my business could have been greatly increased, and I could have employed a much larger number of workmen.

When I find that I cannot pursue my business in this legitimate way; when I find it will not hold its own under natural conditions, I shall give it up. Certain it is, I shall not be found whining about Washington getting the lobby to influence legislation in my favor against the interests of the nation at large.

As to the general principle Mr. Prang is no less emphatic. He says:

Imagine that your business was invested in producing butter, and that you desired to take pay for the surplus of your butter in eggs belonging to a stranger, and that a third party should step between you two and command you to stop your intended exchange until you had paid to him a toll—say of fifty per cent of the value of the eggs, at the same time promising to return that toll to you through various circuitous channels, not easily to be explained? What would you think of such an interference and of such a promise? This is precisely what protection is doing for us in almost every trade transaction we have with a foreign nation.

Trade is the missionary of peace. Obstructing trade means estrangement—the creation of jealousy, of narrow selfishness, of inimical feelings; it leads away from peace. The more that nations exchange the products of the labor of their people, the more their interests become interwoven, the more they become interdependent upon one another, and thus the guarantee of peace between them becomes greater. Our nation being in a position to lead the world by good example, should never champion a policy below the aspirations of that freedom which the genius of the founders of this republic bequeathed to us as a birth-right to be kept sacred and undisturbed. Freedom in all directions should be our watchword; any policy leading away from it breeds mischief and eventually wars.

Carry protection out to its logical end by applying it not only to the nation against all other nations, but to one state against all other states, one city against all other cities, and at last to the family against all other families, and it will not be difficult to picture the effects of such a course to which the history of the middle ages furnishes examples. Now make the same test with the principles of free trade, and it will not be difficult for you to see that the result must be a fitting reward to each individual man and of the nation itself into a higher civilization.

Protection may have fostered a few old industries and created a number of new ones; but at what a terrible cost! It has to a great degree emasculated our industrial life, it has taken out of it the spirit, the freedom, the character. It has depressed the aspiration to the best in the world and to rely on their excellence to sell them in all markets. It has narrowed the aims of a great industrial people from the world's market down to the home market. It has by contracting the field of operation, facilitated the creation of monopolies, combines and trusts. It has killed our proud merchant navy, once the glory of our nation. It has un-Americanized us by making us selfish, narrow, and dependent, where the fathers of this republic proudly declared that a broad humanity should be the leading principle of American civilization.

We have given up the industrial leadership of the world. We have given up our manhood as fearless, independent workers. We have given up the ideas embodied in the Declaration of Independence pointing toward the highest and broadest humanity. Under the impulse of these grand humanitarian ideas slavery was abolished at the cost of a frightful war, which left an enormous debt. To meet this moral obligation, tariff duties were resorted to as a principal means of raising revenue; and when the national debt had passed and the revenue from this source increased beyond any legitimate needs, the reason for continuing these taxes for purposes of revenue was added to this latter name they are now being advocated as of great benefit to the whole nation, and as an inestimable boon to the American workmen in particular. Alas! stripped of its fine verbiage, tariff for protection is but a survival of the system of robbing Peter to aggrandize Paul.

Over production in this country, the bugbear of our industrial era, is an anomaly where so many men and women are suffering for the want of these accumulations of industrial wealth. It is an evidence that the opportunities for work are artificially closed up somehow. If protection had increased the opportunities for profitable labor, as claimed by the protectionists, then the millions now starving would be in a position to earn wages which they could offer in exchange, and which that stagnation in circulation and dis-

tribution which is unfittingly named over production.

Protection, by narrowing our market, by erecting artificial barriers to a free exchange, by raising artificially all our living and manufacturing expenses is, no doubt, one of the great causes of this disease which is breeding congestion in our social organism. Free exchange would act like free air and sunshine; it would purify and invigorate our industrial atmosphere.

Protection means simply protection to the manufacturers of certain commodities. Labor is not protected at all. While the manufacturer has foreign manufactured goods taxed for his benefit, the workingman finds himself completely exposed to the competition of the workmen of the whole world, who come in duty free.

This policy has greatly aided to create the tramp and the million of able-bodied workingmen and women, who for want of work in this blessed land, are always on the point of starvation. It has facilitated the creation of monopolies and trusts, and the more monopolies and trusts the more destruction of small manufacturers and tradesmen, the more dependence and uncertainty for the workingman, the less opportunity for profitable labor, and in consequence the more idle men and women. These idle men and women are dead to trade as consumers, but they are a living source for immorality, intemperance and depression of wages.

If protection has anything to do with the difference between the wages in Europe and America, what causes the great difference in wages in different parts of the United States? Our industries enjoy the same protection in one state as in another, and yet the wages in every single industry, west, east, north and south, differ as much as one hundred per cent from the lowest to the highest. Not so much in our industry of lithography, it is true; but still enough to show that protection has nothing to do with the rate of wages.

If protection could secure higher wages, then the best protected countries should be the eldorado for the workman. But it happens that hordes of starving workmen from the best protected country in Europe, Italy, overflow each spring the border line of free trade Switzerland, to perform there the lowest grade of work for wages which the free trading Swiss allow them to enjoy without jealousy and without fear of competition. Canada, the well protected, honors us with like incursions, and Germany's working classes do not seem to have reached the acme of their happiness since the advent of their manifold protective system, judging from the number of emigrants who flock to the arrival of every German steamer. The fact is that their wages have not increased even in the ratio of their living expenses, but their poverty has.

No, it is not protection which gives our workmen better wages than in Europe; it is the fact that the opportunities for labor here are not yet quite so contracted, and that our workmen have still preserved a sufficient amount of the energy and spirit of the freeman in spite of protection, and have successfully ennobled themselves by capital and monopoly.

Protection is a policy of spoliation of the masses in the interest of a limited class, and the regulating of the industrial affairs of the individual citizen, which protection attempts by pre-eribing through taxes which industries shall be fostered and which restricted, is exactly what the socialists claim should be done, with this difference, that the plan of the socialist is more clearly and logically prepared, and seems to favor less a distinction of classes in its aim and method. To move on these lines, therefore, by the state sets an example of a very dangerous tendency, sustaining the teachings of the socialists that our working people must look to state socialism as a means of bettering their general condition. Protection is also a policy of demoralization. With the establishment of the first custom house, an insidious poison entered our national life. The custom house has made us proverbial seculers at the sanctity of an oath, and tariff taxation has degraded us from the position of self-reliant freemen to the abject condition of industrial wards, crying and begging like babes for more protection against the very nations we are so fond of deprecating as beneath us in the social scale.

Now, I do not believe that free trade will bring down the millennium or free the workingman from all the shackles that capital, monopoly and landlordism have clasped upon him; nor do I believe that the advantages a free trade policy would bring to him would be lasting without other reforms sadly needed in our social organization; but I believe that free trade is necessary as a leader, to be followed by these other reforms, as it will secure to the workingman full and just share of the wealth he helps to create and assure to him an ever present opportunity for profitable labor.

Then we will have men in our industries of higher social and industrial ideals and of unconquerable faith in freedom. Then the workingman will regard himself the peer of the highest and best in the land; he will fear no competitor and will regard every other workingman no matter where placed, as his associate and brother. They will ally themselves to the broad, self-reliant character of such citizenship; then will it control the markets of the world by virtue of the intrinsic worth of its products. Industrial supremacy, even in our home market, on any other basis, would be unworthy of the American character.

The Mills bill points in the direction of greater social freedom, and therefore, and therefore only, it deserves our best support.

Spreading the Light.

Louis Lesaulnier of Red Bud, Illinois, has been for some years one of the most active of our workers, and has circulated hundreds of books, thousands of tracts and many copies of THE STANDARD—all of which he keeps constantly in his store—to sell to those who will buy, and to give or lend to those who, though they will not buy, will read. That he is not afraid to avow his principles, his business cards show. Here is one:

LOUIS LESAULNIER.

RED BUD (Randolph County), ILLINOIS.

Keeps Free Circulating Library of all of Henry George's Publications.

(Other Side.) See Other Side.

Equal right to life, liberty and pursuit of happiness includes equal rights to all natural opportunities. When these possess a rent value, justice demands that we pay it in full as a tax for the privilege to monopolize them against the equal rights of our fellow men.

Our present land and tax laws bring about industrial slavery, etc., in proportion to the increase of population and the difficulty of access to free, desirable lands.

Henry George's single tax will free labor and capital from all their taxes, it will induce the best use of desirable land, it will secure to labor and capital its proper reward, it will make noble and free men out of communities and nations now blindly and foolishly legislating and fighting against each other.

The best government grants its people the fullest amount of liberty compatible with justice and safety.

FREE TRADE THE AMERICAN IDEA.

F. M. Holland in the Free Thinker's Magazine.

One of the first results of independence was the abolition of the British system of restrictions on commerce between the colonies and establishment of free trade throughout an area which long ago became larger than all Europe, and now extends from the Gulf of Mexico to the Arctic, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Pitt's attempt to open similar traffic between Great Britain and Ireland failed in 1785, when the demands of English manufacturers to be protected against Irish cheap labor were supported by Burke, Fox and Sheridan.

Among the very few who wished, a hundred years ago, to enable all nations to trade freely were Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, Albert Gallatin and Pelatiah Webster. In 1774, two years earlier than Smith's "Wealth of Nations," appeared the "Principles of Trade," which was largely due to Franklin's pen, and was recommended by him for circulation here in 1784. The wish is expressed, "that commerce was as free between all nations of the world as it is between the several counties of England." "No nation was ever ruined by trade, even seemingly the most disadvantageous."

In a letter of 1788 Franklin expressed his expectation that American tariffs would be for revenue only. Jefferson was then advocating free trade, as minister to France, and in 1793 he recommended, as secretary of the treasury, that commerce "be relieved of its shackles in all parts of the world." "Would a single nation begin with the United States this system of free exchange, it would be advisable to begin with that nation." Gallatin appeared soon after as an opponent of protection in congress. Pelatiah Webster, a graduate of Yale, who was imprisoned for patriotism by the British in 1778, published the next year an essay, saying, "Take off every restraint and limitation from our commerce. Let trade be as free as air. Let every man make the most of his goods, and in his own way." In 1783 he suggested that revenue should be raised mainly by duties on luxuries, for instance, high priced tea and cloth, while necessities should be taxed but five per cent; and the tariff of 1789 was in much closer harmony with his principles than is that now in force, especially as the average rate of duties was less than one-fifth of the present amount.

Heavy duties for revenue only were kept upon coffee until 1832, and upon tea until 1842, while the attempts of what was called the British faction to increase the imposts on manufactures were resisted by northerners as well as southerners, on the ground that no taxes for the benefit of the few should be imposed on the many. Daniel Webster helped defeat the efforts to high duties on cotton and woolen goods in 1816, when a protectionist majority of congress named "Gold," sought to justify himself by quoting from Sir James Stewart and the "Parliamentary History." The example of Great Britain was appealed to in 1820, together with that of France, Prussia, Holland, Italy and Russia, by protectionists, who admitted that they were asking for a radical change in the tariff, and that it had thus far been levied "more to aid the treasury than to protect industry." They were opposed by representatives from Massachusetts and Connecticut, who not only showed the danger of losing foreign markets and diverting capital into unprofitable industries, but urged that if the channel of trade were left free it would find its proper level with mutual benefit. The Salem merchants sent in a memorial, drawn by Judge Story, and protesting against the proposed duties as "repugnant to those maxims of free trade, which the United States have hitherto so forcibly and persistently maintained for as the sure foundation of national prosperity."

Protection was only a secondary object of legislation before 1824, when it was made paramount by close votes. Clay's assertion that the (protective) bill would "lay the foundation of a genuine American policy" was answered by Webster thus: "This, sir, is an assumption which I take the liberty most devoutly to deny. Since he speaks of the proposed measure as a new era in our legislation, since he professes to invite us to depart from our accustomed course, to instruct ourselves by the wisdom of others and to adopt the policy of the most distinguished foreign states, one is a little anxious to know with what propriety of speech this invention of other nations is denominated an 'American policy,' while on the contrary, a preference for our own established system, as it now actually exists, and always has existed, is called a foreign policy." Mr. Webster wished "freedom of trade to be the general principle, and restriction the exception;" and added: "There is a country, not undistinguished among the nations, in which the progress of manufactures has been far more rapid than in any other, and yet unaided by protection or artificial restrictions. That country, the happiest which the sun shines on, is our own."

The majority of New England's representatives opposed the protective tariff of 1824 and also that of 1828. The latter gave rise to the free trade convention in Philadelphia in 1821 on a call first published in the *Evening Post*, then edited by Bryant. Prominent delegates from the different states were Gallatin, who had been secretary of the treasury from 1801 to 1813. Chief Justice Marshall was also present. The surplus of our revenue, in consequence of the reduction of 1846, was found to be a sufficient reason for a still greater reduction in 1857. At the presidential election the year previous not one of the four principal candidates stood on a protectionist platform. The democrats repeated over and over again their pledge of 1840 against fostering one branch of industry to the detriment of another, or raising more revenue "than is required to defray the necessary expenses." The latter position had been taken by the free soilers also in 1852.

Even in 1862 Emerson spoke at Washington, in Lincoln's presence, of "Free trade, certainly the interest of nations, but by no means the interest of the few, and the danger which tariff feeds fat, and the danger interest of the few overpowers the apathetic general conviction of the many." Bryant was able for more than fifty years to teach the truth that "Free trade is a part of the grand movement of mankind toward a nobler condition of social existence."

These examples, with those of Franklin, Jefferson, Story, and Webster, when at his best, should encourage us to make all our commercial relations as freely and fully American as those between our states.

A Unionist's View of the Irish Situation.

BALTINGLASS, Ireland, June 16.—As a single tax man and unionist, will you kindly allow me a few words in reply to Mr. J. Davison?

With his first letter I agree. The leaders of the nationalist party seem to have gone altogether astray. Ireland wants her land question settled, and the majority of her representatives want to make the confusion existing on that question worse confounded. They would, if they had the power, land us into peasant proprietary to-morrow. The great hope for Ireland is the growth of

sound ideas of taxation among the British democracy. Therefore (and here I evidently part company with Mr. Davison), I am a unionist. When we have our land in our own hands it will be time enough to see about home rule.

At present the average Irish farmer identifies home rule with cheap land. I find the strongest advocates of home rule *per se* are the artisan class in towns, publicans and their assistants.

As to the papal rescript, I have not seen the general white beatification mentioned. True, a splutter here and there takes place, but I believe many are sincerely glad of the veto on boycotting. The plan of campaign is condemned by Mr. Davison in his first letter as an admission of the right of landlords to exact rent, and consequently of the right to devastate the country and "spread havoc and destruction on every hand." "strongly object" to the "policy" on these grounds, but once admit the ownership of the land, and it becomes robbery to hold both the land and the rent; therefore, the Roman Catholic church is bound to oppose it, or (from its own point of view) connive at fraud. Papal interference in such a matter is the natural outcome of the papal office.

THE STANDARD is invaluable. I generally send it on when read, and it is bound to make people think.

A. W. WAUGH.

NEW IDEAS, METHODS AND INVENTIONS.

It is well known that one of the reasons why locomotive engines are made so small is to increase the friction between the driving wheels and the rails; the wheels are then liable to merely slip round without moving the train as they often do. It is now proposed by the use of an electric current to make the driving wheels take a stronger grip on the rails. This will save in power and wear and tear and permit the use of very light engines.

Busswood may be enormously compressed, after which it may be steamed and expanded to its original volume. Advantage has been taken of this principle in the manufacture of certain kinds of moldings. The portions of the wood to be in relief are first compressed or pushed down by suitable dies below the general level of the board, then the board is planed down to a level surface, and the compressed portions are then expanded. Portions of the board are expanded by the steam so that they stand out in relief.

According to Kuhlke's recent experiments at Hamburg have proved it possible to make a gunpowder which will produce little or no smoke when fired and will be as serviceable in all other respects as the present smoke producing powder. By substituting work for wood charcoal, it is further stated, trouble arising from powder absorbing moisture readily will be avoided. If the above statements prove to be borne out by the facts, the use of electric light in powder mills, in a military and in a civil way, can hardly be overrated.

It is announced that five patents were recently issued to a Baltimore electrician covering methods and apparatus for heating by electricity. The inventor, it is claimed, has made a radically new departure in the art of generating electricity, and has thereby avoided the losses incident to all previous efforts in that direction have been practically overcome. By this system dwellings and other buildings are supplied with heat from central generators by the same conductors which now supply them with incandescent electric lights, and at a cost considerably less than the methods of heating now in vogue.

An interesting experiment has been tried with the great artesian well which spouts up in the grounds of the Ponce de Leon hotel, at St. Augustine, Fla. Directly over the well, a shaft of cast iron, of a diameter of six inches in diameter, thirty-five feet into the air, a huge turbine wheel has been placed. Bolted direct to the shaft of this wheel is an Edison dynamo capable of supplying 375 10-candle lamps. Several hundred Edison incandescent lamps have been placed on the walls of the building over the well, and together with the indicating and regulating apparatus make up the dynamo light system. The light generated directly in this way by power derived directly from the earth have proved eminently satisfactory, as far as the steadiness and constancy of the light are concerned.

The corporation of Birmingham, England, is about to institute an entirely new departure in the sale of gas, by the use of "pay-per-delivery" meters. A number of payment meters constructed after the principle of the common automatic supply machines, have been offered by inventors; and a trial of the gas meter has been made in a number of small houses. One or more pennies are dropped into an opening, and the regulating apparatus of the meter liberates a quantity of gas of corresponding value, after which it stops, retaining the advanced rate of price. The gas accumulates in a locked receptacle, and are removed by the collector at intervals. The mechanical arrangements of the meter will, it is believed, render it simple, and they can be manufactured for about \$5 each.

The Gas engine and power company of New York have perfected an engine in which both the fuel and the power are obtained from naphtha. It has been applied to many boats of from sixteen to thirty feet in length and works admirably. The beauty of it is that while it is clean, clean and always ready, it can be managed by anybody. The owners of many well known steam yachts have had naphtha launched upon them and the results have been satisfactory. The engine is started by lighting an alcohol lamp and blowing some naphtha vapor over the flame with a little hand pump. This makes a hot fire and heats the naphtha in a retort. This heated naphtha generates the gas, which drives the engine. After the engine is going, which is in about two minutes, some of the gas in the retort can be used as fuel, and the engine can be run on gas and naphtha together. The engines can be instantly reversed when at the highest speed. Only six per cent of the fluid in the retort is used, the remainder being returned to the tank and used again. A twenty-horse power engine runs a twenty-foot launch and uses three or four quarts of naphtha an hour.

The Gilbert car manufacturing company of Troy, N. Y., has manufactured an electric motor car for the Sprague company, and it will soon be seen on the Ninth avenue elevated. The car is quite novel, and the outside appearance is similar to the passenger cars now in use on the Brooklyn bridge. There are doors in the center, as well as in each end, which will facilitate the ingress and egress of passengers. The motor is attached to the front of the car, and the current is situated over the tracks, and the current is switched from the platform by means of a switch. The motor does not encroach upon the seating capacity of the car, and is a very simple contrivance. The motor car is forty feet long, and has eight forty-two inch wheels that are worked by the electric current, and are called driving wheels. The wheels on the axle have a 240 horse power. The motor will give a drawbar strain of 15,000 pounds, fully double that developed by the present puffly little elevated locomotives. The motor, it is claimed, will pull four cars at the rate of twenty-five miles an hour.

Yes, It Is Land that Attracts People, After All—Free Land.

Boston Herald.

There will be curiosity to watch the growth of Texas under the coming census. This census taken demonstrates that emigration may take place on southern lines as well as northern ones. Nevada is rather worse than stationary, if anything. Colorado advances only as long as her mines attract, and then she grows rapidly poorer. Dakota makes an increase which is almost phenomenal. The southern people who suffered from the war have probably done a good deal to swell the population of Texas.

ENGLAND AND AMERICA.

Where is the Workman Better Off?

We find in the Bradford, England, Observer of May 26, a letter from a Bradford man who has been living in Philadelphia for three years. It will be of interest here, especially as it was evidently written without thought of political effect:

To any one who visits this country with unbounded resources, and who can view life and manners through golden spectacles, everything must seem "just lovely;" but to those who have to work day by day and week by week to keep body and soul together it is far from being "rosy" and delightful as the visitors would make out. Many and many an Englishman who has come to this country full of hope, energy, and ambition, striving honestly to get on, could tell some sad stories of privations and sufferings, and yet such is the power of pride in some hearts that even when suffering the most they yet written glowing letters to their friends at home telling of their glorious prospects in this land of liberty. True, we don't have to doff our hat to the parson or the squire, but at the same time we have to fawn to power, cringe to our superiors, and worship money if we would make an advance at all. And I say, without fear of contradiction, that the working man of America does not enjoy the liberty nor the privileges his fellow worker does in England. The reason is explained by the fact that the dollar in this country is the lever on which everything moves. Business men have no time for either religious sentiment or recreation. The dollar consideration is above all others, and those who get possession are the smart men of the country, the means employed in getting rich being a secondary matter altogether.

It may be asked how Americans are so easily got rich so quickly, and the question is a rule answered. The whole country is ruled, governed and monopolized by moneyed combinations, syndicates and trusts. First and foremost, the country is protected. Then the capitalists join hands to fight everybody else. Then the manufacturers form a "combination." Then the merchants form a syndicate and the middle man a trust. The workman becomes a "Knight of Labor," and a sorry sort of figure he makes of himself, for in spite of his every endeavor he is held down by the iron hand of tyranny. Who gets the best of all this protection? Not the working man. True, he earns \$10 or \$12 a week while his fellow laborer in England is only making 2s.; but the Englishman is the best off of the finish.

Let me cite a case in point. A friend of the writer—an Englishman—has at present employed by a large wholesale house in this city as double entry book keeper. He is a clever accountant, quick and accurate at figures, besides being a splendid penman. The remuneration he receives is \$10 a week. A man in England—if he was badly paid—would receive say 28s. a week for doing similar work. The Englishman would go down to the office at 8:30 or nine o'clock in the morning and would get through his work by six in the evening. He would occupy a little cottage, live comfortably, and, if he was a careful man, might enjoy life rationally. Not so the American book keeper. He must stroll down to the office at seven o'clock in the morning; if he is five minutes late he is fined ten cents; and, if it is required of him, he must work until ten or eleven o'clock at night without any extra remuneration. Now let us see how far this \$10 will go:

Rent for bed room (a poor one at that).....	\$2 50
Seven days meat and restaurant.....	\$2 50
Coal for cooking at that.....	\$2 50
Washing.....	50
Car fare to his room.....	50
Sundry.....	2 10
.....	\$10 00

Out of \$2 10 he must keep himself in pocket money and buy his clothes, which are double the price they are in England. He must pay ten cents (5d.) for his shoe "shining," the same amount for shaving, and twenty cents for haircutting; in short, if he had 28s. a week in England he would be a good deal better off than he is, or possibly can be, with 40s. here, and he would not have to work half so hard.

To those at home who have a trade, my advice is, stay where you are. To those who have no trade, but think themselves smart, the advice is the same. If they have friends here who are doing well, it makes some little difference; but I would say to them, "Don't come thinking you will earn money easily and without trouble; for if you do, just as surely you will wish yourselves back in old Bradford again."

OVERSHOT RECIPROCITY.

How Canada is Protected Against the Labor of the United States.

Canada wants a tariff to protect her labor from the encroachments of "the pauper labor" of the United States, and the United States want a tariff to protect their labor from the encroachments of "the pauper labor" of Canada. Here is an example from the *Halifax Chronicle* of the way in which this kind of overshoot reciprocity works. American workmen took a good opportunity to work in Canada, and they did so, a good opportunity to pay high prices for what they used, Canadian monopolists pocketing the plunder. The *Chronicle* speaking of Hamilton, says:

That city wanted a quantity of glazed sewer pipes, and tenders were asked for. The Buffalo sewer pipe company offered to deliver the goods at Hamilton, duty not paid, at the following prices per foot:

Straight.	Curves.	Junctions.
9-inch.....	15c. per ft.	60c. each.
12-inch.....	20c. per ft.	70c. each.
15-inch.....	25c. per ft.	80c. each.
18-inch.....	30c. per ft.	90c. each.
21-inch.....	35c. per ft.	1 00 each.
24-inch.....	40c. per ft.	1 10 each.
27-inch.....	45c. per ft.	1 20 each.
30-inch.....	50c. per ft.	1 30 each.
33-inch.....	55c. per ft.	1 40 each.
36-inch.....	60c. per ft.	1 50 each.
39-inch.....	65c. per ft.	2 00 each.
42-inch.....	70c. per ft.	2 10 each.
45-inch.....	75c. per ft.	2 20 each.
48-inch.....	80c. per ft.	2 30 each.
51-inch.....	85c. per ft.	2 40 each.
54-inch.....	90c. per ft.	2 50 each.
57-inch.....	95c. per ft.	3 00 each.
60-inch.....	1 00 per ft.	3 10 each.
63-inch.....	1 05 per ft.	3 20 each.
66-inch.....	1 10 per ft.	3 30 each.
69-inch.....	1 15 per ft.	3 40 each.
72-inch.....	1 20 per ft.	3 50 each.
75-inch.....	1 25 per ft.	4 00 each.
78-inch.....	1 30 per ft.	4 10 each.
81-inch.....	1 35 per ft.	4 20 each.
84-inch.....	1 40 per ft.	4 30 each.
87-inch.....	1 45 per ft.	4 40 each.
90-inch.....	1 50 per ft.	4 50 each.
93-inch.....	1 55 per ft.	4 60 each.
96-inch.....	1 60 per ft.	4 70 each.
99-inch.....	1 65 per ft.	4 80 each.
102-inch.....	1 70 per ft.	4 90 each.
105-inch.....	1 75 per ft.	5 00 each.
108-inch.....	1 80 per ft.	5 10 each.
111-inch.....	1 85 per ft.	5 20 each.
114-inch.....	1 90 per ft.	5 30 each.
117-inch.....	1 95 per ft.	5 40 each.
120-inch.....	2 00 per ft.	5 50 each.

The Campbell sewer pipe company, a home company, tendered the following rates for the same goods, or rather the same class of goods, and it is not claimed that they are any better than the American article:

Straight.	Curves.	Junctions.
9-inch.....	30c. per ft.	\$1 00 each.
12-inch.....	40c. per ft.	\$1 20 each.
15-inch.....	50c. per ft.	\$1 40 each.
18-inch.....	60c. per ft.	\$1 60 each.
21-inch.....	70c. per ft.	\$1 80 each.
24-inch.....	80c. per ft.	\$2 00 each.
27-inch.....	90c. per ft.	\$2 20 each.
30-inch.....	1 00 per ft.	\$2 40 each.
33-inch.....	1 10 per ft.	\$2 60 each.
36-inch.....	1 20 per ft.	\$2 80 each.
39-inch.....	1 30 per ft.	\$3 00 each.
42-inch.....	1 40 per ft.	\$3 20 each.
45-inch.....	1 50 per ft.	\$3 40 each.
48-inch.....	1 60 per ft.	\$3 60 each.
51-inch.....	1 70 per ft.	\$3 80 each.
54-inch.....	1 80 per ft.	\$4 00 each.
57-inch.....	1 90 per ft.	\$4 20 each.
60-inch.....	2 00 per ft.	\$4 40 each.
63-inch.....	2 10 per ft.	\$4 60 each.
66-inch.....	2 20 per ft.	\$4 80 each.

